DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 604 95 SP 009 673

AUTHOR Rosen, Jacqueline L.
TITLE Perceptions of the Childhood Self and Teacher-Child Relations. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, N.Y. Div. of Research.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-3-1489
PUB DATE Aug 75
GRANT NE-G-00-3-0138
NOTE 112p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Autobiographies; *Childhood; Family Role; Gifted; Graduate Study; Predictive Ability (Testing); Psychological Testing; Slow Learners; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Qualifications; Test Construction

ABSTRACT

The goal of this research project was to design a personality test which would help select, guide, and place prospective teachers into situations where they would be happiest and most effective. A Developmental Self and Child Concept Scales (DSCCS) test was developed and administered to 81 women attending a graduate teacher training program. In the fall, the subjects had to answer questions about themselves as a child and themselves at that time. In the spring, they answered questions about their actual teaching experiences. Their advisors rated them on the same questions. Some of the results were as follows: (1) teachers' preference for active, aggressive, outgoing children, or shy, passive, withdrawn children was linked to which way they were as children themselves; (2) teachers who had had more secure, happy childhoods preferred outgoing children; (3) teachers who preferred gifted children viewed themselves as more gifted as children but also as more troubled; (4) teachers judged poor/fair seemed to have had the least resources to draw on in identifying with children or with positive adult role models; (5) "Myself as a Child" impressions were better indicators of teaching ability than "Myself Now;" and (6) individuals' and advisors' assessment of competence were similar. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115604

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHILDHOOD SELF AND TEACHER-CHILD RELATIONS

Jacqueline L. Rosen, Ph.D.

August 1975

Research Division
Bank Street College of Education
610 West 112th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

Final Report
National Institute of Education
Grant No. NE-G-00-3-0138
Project No. 3-1489

SP 009 673

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is deeply grateful to Marcia Judson for her invaluable assistance in designing, constructing, and pretesting the instrument of the study, in planning and carrying out the data collection, in preparing the data for computer analysis, and for her support through all phases of the study; to Doris Wallace for her help in the development of the instrument, her expertise in editing the final report, and her constant interest in this research; to Lodema Burrows for her leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the student teachers and the advisors who participated in the study, and for her assistance in arranging for and carrying out the collection of the data; to the student teachers and their advisors who gave time and thought in supplying the data for the study; to Elizabeth and Richard Martin for their incredible accuracy in coding the responses; to Herbert Zimiles for his helpful comments on this report; to Marilyn C. Lee for her advice on statistical analysis; to Ruth Kolbe for her patience and careful editing, and for her skill in transforming rough drafts into finished manuscripts and tables; and to the National Institute of Education which made the study possible.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE CHILDHOOD SELF AND TEACHER-CHILD RELATIONS

Jacqueline L. Rosen, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

How can prospective teachers who are able to develop good teacher-child relations be differentiated from those who are psychologically unsuited for work with children? How can teachers be matched with children whom they are likely to work with most effectively? These questions have guided the present investigation on the personality of the teacher, which is part of a program of studies aimed at generating knowledge and method relevant for selecting and placing teaching personnel. The assumptions underlying this work are (1) that the quality of teacher-child relations is a key variable in the classroom, exerting a basic influence on children's attitudes toward learning, toward society, and toward themselves; (2) that adults vary widely in their capacity to develop positive relations with children; and (3) that given the basic personality potentials for developing positive relations, adults vary in their ability to work effectively with children who have differing dominant needs and coping styles.

It has been found in the investigator's studies that autobiographical essays bearing on prospective teachers' concepts of their childhood selves and their recalled relations with their parents can yield predictors of their ability to relate to children in general, and also of their effectiveness with children of different ages, personalities and coping styles. It appeared, therefore, that the autobiography had excellent potential as an instrument to be applied in the selection and placement of teachers. At the same time, however, it was recognized that problems posed by the analysis of such unstructured material would limit its general usefulness. The analysis is time-consuming, and valid assessments of the data can require a clinical expertise that is not widely available in teacher-training institutions. An important next step, therefore, was to

construct an instrument that would permit a more systematic, objective, and efficient assessment of the personality-related phenomena than had been obtained from analysis of the autobiography.

The goals of the present study were to construct such an instrument and to examine the feasibility of this methodological shift by cross-validating and extending the earlier findings.

This report consists of five sections:

(1) Background. This section outlines the state of teacher personality research in general, and describes the work of the investigator that led up to the present study.

(2) Specific Aims consists of a statement of the hypotheses to be tested in the present study.

(3) Method. This section describes the development of the new instrument and other procedures for carrying out the study's aims.

(4) Results and Discussion presents and discusses each set of findings in turn.

(5) Conclusions and Implications focuses on the conclusions that can be drawn from the study and its implications for teacher selection and placement, and future research.

BACKGROUND

State of the Teacher Personality Research Field in General

There has been a voluminous amount of research in the field of teacher personality; but this research has been characterized by widespread failure to find substantial, consistent, and interpretable correlations between personality data and teaching performance. It has been over a decade since Getzels and Jackson (1963) reviewed the educational literature in this field, and concluded that research had contributed virtually nothing toward the prediction of teaching performance; and by and large their assessment still holds today. (In fact, whether as the result of their chastisement or not, there has been a sharp decline in work on the problem since that review appeared.) Getzels and Jackson cited many reasons for the unproductiveness of the studies. Among these are: (1) the use of standard personality tests, many of which had been devised for other purposes (e.g., the diagnosis of psychopathological conditions); (2) failure to delimit the various criteria of teacher "effectiveness" being applied (e.g., interpersonal dimensions are not differentiated from cognitive dimensions); (3) a lack of theory to guide the research and a lack of interpretation of significant correlations. In addition, teacher personality studies have failed to conceptualize teacher effectiveness as a criterion that varies with the characteristics of the children being taught, including their age level (the teacher's role and tasks being dramatically different at the preschool, primary grade, and upper elementary levels). Thus, study samples are not described in these terms. It is not surprising therefore that the vast majority of findings have made little sense in terms of any theory, or that significant correlations between scores on personality tests and teaching performance in one study could not be replicated in another.

The present investigator's studies of teacher personality and teacher-child relations have been carried out since Getzels and Jackson assessed the state of the field; and they have overcome some of the major obstacles that have been cited. As indicated at the outset, the studies have used autobiographical data rather than standard tests as the means of assessing teacher personality; and further, the findings do make sense on theoretical grounds. Finally, the criteria have been delimited to the interpersonal dimensions of teacher attitudes and effectiveness; and personality correlates of relative effectiveness with children of varied ages have been identified.

The remainder of this section contains a description of the investigator's previous studies that bear on the value of autobiographical material for predicting teacher-child relations and also for explaining career choice within the field of education. Finally, the rationale is presented for the methodological shift to a more structured instrument and for the choice of its format.

Autobiographical Studies Relevant to Predicting Teacher-Child Relations

The investigator's interest in teacher personality studies using subjects' autobiographical descriptions of their childhoods arose from earlier research on a group of 20 child-care workers (14 women and 6 men from both middle and lower social-class backgrounds) in a residential treatment facility, in which the subjects' attitudes toward and feelings of competence in working with the children in their care were found to be strongly associated with variations in their descriptions of their childhood selves (Rosen, 1963). The study data, which were obtained from a series of individual, semi-structured interviews held over time, revealed, for example, that the workers felt most positively toward the children whose dominant needs and coping styles, though exaggerated in expression, most closely resembled their own childhood patterns as they portrayed them. In parallel, they felt most negatively toward children who displayed characteristics that

were diametrically opposed to those they recalled in themselves. They also felt most competent in working with children whose tendencies toward aggressiveness or withdrawal--two major types of behavior that constantly confronted them in their work--were similar to their own early tendencies in one direction or the other. None of the workers was aware of these associations. They did not realize that they had previously described the child they liked best in the same terms which (three weeks later) they had used in characterizing themselves as children and that they had actually named that child at this later time as being most like the childhood self.[1] They did recognize, however, that their reasons for liking or for feeling competent in working with certain children were related to a feeling of empathy with them, a sense of being able to communicate with them and to respond positively to their needs. At the same time, the workers gave evidence of marked difficulty in understanding and finding avenues by which to approach the children toward whom they felt negatively and with whom they felt least competent in their work. While the sample was small, the findings transcended social-class differences in the workers.

The first study of student teachers (Rosen, 1968) was based on 44 subjects--38 women and 6 men--from six undergraduate teacher-training institutions in the New York City area and who were close to their graduation at the time the autobiographical data and other personality assessment materials were collected. A year later, toward the end of their first year as full-fledged teachers of pre- or elementary-school children, the subjects were observed at different times in

---

1. Fifteen of the 20 workers did so; and none of them named the child-liked-least as the one resembling the childhood self. In parallel, 14 workers expressed strong negative attitudes toward the children they later specified as being "the child-least-like me." There were 24 children in the institution where the study took place, and every child evoked a strong emotional response--either positive or negative in some worker. Moreover, every child who evoked a negative response in one worker, elicited strong positive reactions in another.

their classrooms by four educators who supplied the criterion ratings. The ratings (made on a 7-point scale) reflected the degree to which the subjects had developed positive or negative relations with the children they were teaching. It was found that ratings on this measure were substantially associated with the autobiographical data in two ways. First, the high-rated subjects tended to use strong positive affect words in recalling their early lives, while the low-rated subjects seldom used words denoting enthusiasm for any aspects of their childhoods (bi-serial $r=.51$, $p < .01$). Second, of the subjects who exceeded the median rating (who had developed good relations with children), 72% described their childhood selves in predominantly favorable terms, and specifically in one or more of the following ways:

> ...an early sense of independence, resourcefulness, feelings of social adequacy, and ability to achieve something that had been important to them. Even though they described childhood fears as frequently as their less-liked counterparts, the better-liked group pictured their childhood generally as a happy, secure time and themselves as having enjoyed their lives in an active way. In the rare cases where the circumstances of their childhood were described as difficult, emphasis was on how they had conquered adversity (p. 299).

In contrast, the low-rated subjects--those at or below the median--77% focused on:

> ...unpleasant feelings from their early lives and conveyed less sense of childhood ego strength. Some described qualities they seemed to reject about their childhood selves; others appeared to be still resentful of early deprivation. Their descriptions included recollections of self-consciousness, being overly dependent, having worried a lot, feeling unwanted...patterns of withdrawal....In general, these subjects conveyed the impression that their childhood had been an insecure time, when life had happened to them, rather than their having lived it actively and by their own initiative (pp. 301-302).

Since the findings of this study were potentially relevant to problems of teacher selection, it was important to know if similar associations would be found if the autobiographies were written by actual applicants for teacher training, rather than by subjects in a standard research project. A second study

(Rosen, 1974) was therefore undertaken with a group of 48 women student teachers who were enrolled in a graduate teacher-training program which routinely requires all prospective candidates to submit, among other application data, an autobiographical essay. In this study, the criterion ratings of the subjects' abilities to relate to children were obtained from student advisors at the end of the training year. (The advisors have intensive contact with their students and also observe them in classrooms throughout their training.) This time the criterion ratings were made on a 4-step scale: Poor, Fair, Good, and Outstanding. The autobiographies were analyzed on the same two dimensions as in the earlier study; and the findings paralleled the earlier results.[1] Those based on the "characterization of the childhood self" were especially impressive at the extremes (see Table below).

Ratings of Capacity to Relate to Children and Autobiographical Characterization of the Childhood Self (N=48)*

	Characterization of Childhood Self	
Ratings	Positive	Negative
Outstanding	16	2
Good	9	6
Fair	1	6
Poor	0	8
Totals	26	22

*Chi square = 19.6; df = 1, $p < .01$.

While the two studies just described had implications for selecting prospective teachers, it was important to find out whether the autobiography could also be used as a basis for guiding and placing them with the kinds of children with whom they were likely to be most effective. This called for a more differentiated

---

1. Chi-square tests were applied to the combined totals of the top two and bottom two categories (Good and Outstanding vs. Fair and Poor). P values for the Characterizations of the Childhood Self and for the Affect Variable were .01 and .05 respectively.

approach to the criteria of good teacher-child relations.

The importance of a differentiated approach was stressed years ago by an educator and a psychiatrist working jointly to incorporate mental health principles into the training of teachers. Biber and Bernard (1958) took the position that a search for the ideal teacher who can work effectively with all children is unrealistic, but that knowledge of personality factors that facilitate or obstruct teacher functioning in relation to key classroom variables, such as the age level of the children taught, could serve as a basis for developing more effective screening, training, and placement.

Despite growing recognition of the need for such differentiated knowledge (e.g., Tanner and Lindgren, 1971), we could find only one study (Wright and Tuska, 1967) which had bearing on the problem of how--and why--relationships between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness [illegible] function of the age level taught. Moreover, no study of teacher personality appears to have been concerned with the age level variable within the presecondary range, or with the preschool years which are now widely viewed as critical. Yet the range from preschool through the upper elementary grades encompasses such dramatic developmental change in children in all areas of functioning that the teachers of these children are confronted with very different cognitive, affective, and physical demands.

We had reason to believe that autobiographies might yield indicators of adults' abilities to meet the differing demands for work with children of different ages, as a result of the child-care worker study. Specifically, because the child-care workers' descriptions of their childhood selves so consistently paralleled the needs and coping styles of the children with whom they subjectively felt able to work most competently, we reasoned that the autobiographies of student teachers might similarly yield indicators of their capacities to work

effectively with children who display different needs and coping styles as a function of age or developmental stage.

In the second (replication) study of student teachers (Rosen, 1974), we had obtained the advisors' judgments of the level at which each of the subjects worked most and least effectively, as roughly demarcated by the preschool, primary, and upper elementary years. (All the students had worked with children of different ages during their training year.) In another study (Rosen, 1972), 37 autobiographies from that sample were divided into three groups, according to the levels at which the subjects had been judged as working most effectively (i.e., 2-5 years, 10 subjects; 5-8 years, 14 subjects; and 8-11 years, 13 subjects).[1] Each set of autobiographies was examined for characteristic themes. We were able to distinguish the groups on this basis to a high degree: only one subject in each group did not conform; and there was little overlap among the groups.[2] The autobiographical themes mirrored dominant needs and coping styles of children with whom the subjects were judged as working best, and to reflect the potential sources of gratification (via identification with the children and with adult models from childhood) theoretically available to the subjects in working with children of that age. For instance, the subjects who were judged as working most effectively with preschoolers described the joys and sense of security they had had as young children, of loving and supportive parents and other

---

1. Since our interest here was in problems of placement, not in selection, we eliminated the subjects who had been judged as "poor" in their overall relations with children in the replication study (Rosen, 1974).

2. In order to determine whether the categorization of subjects by autobiographical themes could be objectively verified, approximately half the autobiographies in each "age" category (19 protocols in all) were chosen at random, and a second judge was asked to sort them into age categories on the basis of the set of themes they contained. Without direction as to the number of autobiographies to be sorted into each category, the judge duplicated the original age group assignment in all but two (i.e., in 89%) of the cases.

important adults who had provided them with solid values and also opened up the world to them as an exciting place. Those judged most effective with primary school children (five- to eight-year-olds) emphasized how they had valued, or actually assumed, independent or grown-up roles, or they stressed their early need to master or achieve basic skills. Those judged most effective with upper elementary children (eight- to eleven-year-olds), while revealing greater diversity in personality-related themes, recalled adults or older siblings who had stimulated in them a love of learning and ideas, and emphasized the importance of their peers in the course of growing up. By taking account of children's developmental needs and reciprocal teacher roles at each of these levels, these findings led to the construction of a consistent rationale for the thematic differences found among the three groups.

Based on these studies, there was reason to believe that autobiographies on childhood contain strong potential for predicting and explaining variations in adult relations with children. In fact, the findings have since been successfully applied in the selection and guidance of successive groups of teachers in a two-year training program in educational leadership at Bank Street College of Education. Our predictions, based on autobiographies which trainees submitted as part of their application to the leadership training program, have been confirmed, both with respect to the trainees' ability to develop good teacher-child relations, and to their differing effectiveness with children of varied age-groups. Moreover, because the majority of the trainees in this program were black, or came from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, there was reason to believe that the findings from the investigator's past studies, which were based largely on samples of white, middle-class women, might cut across ethnic and socioeconomic lines. This expectation was also supported by the study of child-care workers described at the outset.

Autobiographical Studies Relevant to Career Goals and Patterns

In the first study of student teachers, cited earlier (Rosen, 1968), a separate analysis was conducted, bearing on the subjects' long-range career plans. Specifically, the subjects were asked on a questionnaire what they hoped to be at age fifty if they remained in the school system. They were given five response choices--one, to be a classroom teacher, and the others to be administrators or a college teacher. The difference between the responses of the high-rated and the low-rated subjects (those who were best- and least-liked by children, respectively) was sharply defined, though in an unanticipated direction. The subjects who were rated high on their teacher-class relations (and had described their childhood selves with a sense of self-esteem) almost invariably hoped to move out of classroom teaching, and those who were rated low (and described their childhood selves negatively) just as consistently hoped to remain (bi-serial r= .85, $p < .01$).

On the surface, a reversal of these relationships might have made more sense. Young prospective teachers, on the brink of their careers, might be expected to choose to remain classroom teachers when confronted with hypothetical alternatives involving dim, far-distant goals--especially if they get on well with children and seem to enjoy them. Those who are already thinking of becoming principals or college teachers while still in training to become teachers should be those who view the teaching of young children merely as a stepping-stone to positions of greater prestige or power and, thus, they should show relatively little investment in working with children in the classroom.

But data from interviews held with the subjects led to the conclusion that the high-rated subjects had a sense of growing competence and psychological movement forward and that they welcomed challenge and progress as part of life, for children and for themselves; and that the low-rated subjects were guarded and

resistant to change, avoiding rather than seeking opportunities to develop themselves, and that their goals for children were oriented more toward the needs of adults (including their own) than toward fostering psychological growth in children. From this standpoint, the expressed long-range goals of the two groups could be viewed as reflecting personality differences which were consonant with their present views of themselves, with their overall expectations of themselves in the future, and also with their perspectives on their childhood selves.

These findings have been supported in a further study which we are just completing on the actual career patterns of a group of middle-class, middle-aged women educators. Analyzing the ways in which these subjects described themselves and their childhood selves in autobiographies which they wrote some 20 to 25 years ago when they applied for teacher-training, we found that the subjects who had actually continued to teach children throughout their careers described both their childhood selves and themselves as young adults differently from the subjects who had moved out of the classroom to assume administrative, supervisory or college teaching roles. The differences were strikingly parallel to those of the above study of student teachers and their career plans. Further, in a follow-up career development questionnaire which we recently sent to these subjects, differences were evident in their attitudes toward themselves, their careers, and social changes such as the women's movement that were still consonant with their views of themselves, expressed over two decades ago, as actively coping and confident or as relatively passive and unsure.

Throughout this program of studies we have been impressed with the consistency with which our findings support Murray's (1938) conclusions about autobiographical memories for explaining behavior, based on his classic study of college students. He acknowledged that much of the past that finds expression in behavior is not readily available to consciousness; however, based on the relationships

found in his study between the subjects' memories and their observed behavior, he concluded that, among the countless traces of past events, the few that can be recovered in consciousness have special significance, and are lastingly influential in behavior.

Need for a New Instrument and Rationale for the Format Chosen

Since a long-range goal of this program of studies was to contribute a valid method for assessing adult personality that could be widely applied in the selection, training and guidance of adults choosing to work with children, the need for a more systematic and efficient means of obtaining and assessing the personality data now became evident. Although the unstructured autobiography had proved exceedingly useful for assessing personality in relatively small samples, the analysis of such data is often time-consuming and, as already mentioned, often requires judgment based on inference and clinical considerations. The next step, therefore, was to develop a method for obtaining analogous data in a systematic format in which objectivity of scoring or categorization would be greatly facilitated. To this end, we proposed to translate the relevant autobiographical variables into the basic format of the Semantic Differential technique.

The Semantic Differential, which was developed by Osgood and his associates (see, for example, Osgood and Suci, 1969), is a combination of association and scaling procedures designed to give an objective measure of the connotative meaning of concepts. In referring to the underlying logic, Osgood and Luria (1969) state:

> The process of description or judgment can be conceived as the allocation of a concept to a set of experiential continua defined by pairs of polar terms. Thus the connotative meaning of a linguistically complex assertion, such as "My father has always been a rather submissive person," can be at least partially represented as
>
> MY FATHER: active ___:___:___:___:_X_:___:___ passive
>
> MY FATHER: soft ___:_X_:___:___:___:___:___ hard

> The greater the strength of association, e.g., "...extremely submissive, a regular doormat," the more polarized, toward 1 or 7, the allocation (p. 505).

Osgood's Semantic Differential involved repeated judgments of a concept against a series of descriptive polar-adjectival scales on a 7-point equal-interval ordinal scale. These scales were usually selected from 50 pairs of polar adjectives, with heavy factor loadings labeled (1) Evaluative, on which are based the attitudinal measures, (2) Activity, and (3) Potency.

In scoring the Differential, weights can be assigned to each position which, in turn, can be converted to individual or group mean scores or categorized in nominal scales. Reliability of the differential is high, and the measure has a high degree of face validity.

Some researchers have concentrated on the classic list of 50 word-pairs, factor-analyzed by Osgood. But for other researchers (e.g., Mindak, 1969; Wright and Tuska, 1962), the standardized list has not been sufficiently flexible or appropriate to the specific problems at hand. These researchers have found it necessary to construct tailor-made word and phrase lists that can be derived from content analyses of relevant interviews, word association tests, anecdotes, etc.

Of special relevance here is the work of Wright and Tuska (1967). These investigators, who studied student teachers, adapting the Semantic Differential format, selected some of Osgood's scales and also developed new scales out of anecdotal material. Their results indicated that both sets of scales were extremely valuable for predicting and explaining student teacher preferences to work at the elementary or the high school levels, in terms of their subjects' identification with adult figures from their childhoods as relevant in these preferences. This work supported not only this investigator's choice of the Semantic Differential format, but also the focus on "childhood" variables.

The Semantic Differential has special advantages for studies of attitudes

toward or perceptions of the self which require indications not only of direction but also of intensity. In the present investigator's work, student teachers who were judged as "outstanding" in their relations with children, for example, described themselves in autobiographies in terms conveying self-esteem but, more than this, they used strong positive affect words denoting enthusiasm for their childhoods. On the other hand, student teachers who were judged to be poor in their relations with children described themselves in negative terms using no strong positive affect words (Rosen, 1968, 1974). Translated into the format of the Semantic Differential it was postulated that adults who are judged to develop good relations with children would rate their childhood selves more positively on more dimensions than would adults who are judged to develop poor relations with children.

Finally, the Semantic Differential format has the advantage of permitting possible determination of which aspects of the childhood self are perceived by the adult as most central, through the identification of scales that are rated toward extreme, as opposed to neutral, positions. The importance of this is underscored by the research both on student teachers (in which the subjects who worked most effectively with preschoolers, primary grade children, and children in the upper elementary years emphasized in their autobiographies quite different dimensions of their childhood selves), and on child-care workers (whose descriptions of their childhood selves paralleled those of the children whom they liked best and with whom they felt most competent).

SPECIFIC AIMS

In the context of the long-range goal of contributing both to a theory of teacher personality and teacher-child relations and to the development of a valid and efficient method for predicting teacher-child relations that can be widely applied to selecting and placing teaching personnel, the specific aims of the present study were:

A. To submit to systematic test the following hypotheses which had been derived from previous studies:

1. Adults who are judged to develop effective relations with children perceive their childhood selves more positively on more dimensions than do adults who are judged to develop poor relations with children.
2. Adults who are judged as being most effective with preschool children, primary grade children, and upper elementary children (these levels approximating different developmental stages in childhood) perceive their childhood selves differently from one another.
3. Adults who are judged as working more effectively with outgoing, assertive, active children perceive their childhood selves differently from adults who are judged as being more effective with shy, withdrawn, passive children, the differing self-perceptions paralleling the characteristics of the children with whom each group works best.
4. The characteristics of children with whom adults <u>subjectively</u> feel they can work most effectively are more closely related to the characteristics such adults attribute to their own childhood selves than are the characteristics of children with whom the adults feel they can work least effectively.
5. The adult's perceived childhood self is a better predictor of adult-child relations than is the perceived adult self.

B. To carry out supplementary analyses which extend and complement tests of the study hypothesis.

C. To bring this program of research to a more rigorous methodological level by substituting for the autobiographical essay a tailor-made semantic differential for assessing adults' perceptions of their childhood selves.

METHOD

Construction of the New Instrument: The Developmental Self and Child-Concept Scales (DSCCS)

The new instrument (the DSCCS) was developed out of the findings and theoretical considerations guiding the investigator's previous studies (as outlined in Background).

Our first step was to review all the autobiographical themes and concepts that had emerged from the investigator's studies of prospective teachers and of child-care workers, and to extract themes and concepts which characterized each of the following groups of subjects:

prospective teachers who had been judged as outstanding in their overall capacity to relate to children;

prospective teachers who had been judged as poor in their overall relations with children (i.e., as psychologically unsuited to work with children);

prospective teachers who had been judged as most effective with preschool children;

prospective teachers who had been judged as most effective with primary grade children;

prospective teachers who had been judged as most effective with upper elementary children;

child-care workers who felt most competent with outgoing, aggressive, active children;

child-care workers who felt most competent with shy, withdrawn, passive children.

We then attempted to capture the themes and concepts relevant to each group in adjectives or phrases that could be applied to the childhood self in a semantic differential format; and phrases that would pertain to pertinent dimensions of family relations in a somewhat different format; and then constructed appropriate opposing adjectives or phrases.

For example, one of the major themes recurring in the autobiographies of

subjects who were judged as working best with preschool children was a childhood sense of feeling loved, secure, and of coming from a warm, close-knit family. Out of this theme we developed pairs of items such as loved vs. unloved, secure vs. insecure, trusting vs. wary--to be applied to the concept of the childhood self; and warm, close-knit vs. distant, loosely-knit--to be applied to family relations.

While most of the items were generated by the autobiographical studies, we added additional items which were considered to be potentially relevant to the exploratory aims of the present research, as outlined at the end of this section. We also included selected items from Osgood's classic list (Osgood and Suci, 1969).

All of the above resulted in an initial list of approximately 150 bipolar adjectives or phrases. In order to reduce the list we eliminated items on the basis of excessive repetition, questionable relevance, and possibilities for gross misinterpretation. Further items were omitted during pretest procedures.

Throughout all stages of its construction and in the final pretesting of the instrument, teachers and prospective teachers representing a wide range of ages and social class backgrounds served both as subjects and as consultants. At each stage they were asked for written or verbal comments about any difficulties, ambiguities, or omissions they had encountered with the instrument (including the adjectives and phrases used, instructions, etc.); and their criticisms and suggestions were taken into account in further revisions.

Based on the semantic differential format, but using 6-point[1] instead of the classic 7-point scales, the final form of the DSCCS consists of five sections.

---

1. Six-point scales, which force a choice in direction, were judged to be more appropriate to the purposes for which the instrument was developed.

Four of these sections contain the same 60 pairs of bipolar, personality-related adjectives or descriptive phrases. In each of these four sections, the same 60 items are applied to a different concept; i.e., MYSELF AS A CHILD; MYSELF NOW; A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH; and A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH.[1] In addition to the general instructions for completing the questionnaire, brief guidelines precede the presentation of each concept (except that of MYSELF NOW), as follows: For MYSELF AS A CHILD, "Think back to when you were a child. How would you describe yourself?"; for A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH, "Think of a child you have especially enjoyed working with. How would you describe him/her?"; and for A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH, "Think of a child you have least enjoyed working with. How would you describe him/her?" At the end of the scales assessing the self-as-child, the subject is asked for the age level at which he or she was thinking about the self in responding to this section; and for the child most- and least-enjoyed respectively, the subject is asked to identify the age and sex of the child he or she had in mind.

The fifth section consists of eight pairs of bipolar phrases, also presented as 6-point scales. Instead of being applied to one central concept, each scale is designed to reflect a different dimension of the subject's recalled relations within the family of origin; e.g., AS A CHILD, I FELT MY PARENTS almost always understood me vs. almost never understood me; I WOULD DESCRIBE MY FAMILY AS warm, close-knit vs. distant, loosely-knit; WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY PARENTS set many limits on my behavior vs. set almost no limits. (The complete DSCCS, including instructions, is presented in Appendix A.)

---

1. As will be noted later in this section, in the present study the latter two concepts were administered to the subjects some six months after the first two concepts, as part of the criterion phase of the research.

The Sample

The sample consisted of 81 women enrolled in a graduate teacher-training program.[1] The majority were graduates of liberal arts colleges in their twenties who had had little or no teaching experience. Approximately 50% were from upper-middle-class backgrounds, and approximately 25% each from lower-middle and working-class backgrounds. Sixty-four of the subjects were white and 17 were black.

Data Collection

The data for the study were collected in two stages. The predictive data were ob ained from the subjects in the fall of the academic year; and the criterion data were obtained from the subjects and from their college advisors the following spring. The collection of the criterion data was thus carried out after the subjects had had the opportunity to engage in apprentice teaching in several classrooms in different types of schools; and similarly, their advisors had had the opportunity to observe the subjects with children of varying ages in a variety of educational programs and schools over time and had further come to know their subjects' personal and professional strengths and weaknesses through the weekly and biweekly group and individual conferences which were part of the college's advisement program.

Predictive data. The predictive data consisted of the subjects' responses to three sections of the DSCCS: MYSELF NOW, MYSELF AS A CHILD, and the FAMILY RELATIONS items. These data (as well as the criterion data) were collected in specially arranged group sessions, consisting of between 20 to 30 subjects.

---

1. As projected, the study sample was to consist of 100 women subjects, a figure based on past enrollment figures in Bank Street College's preservice teacher education program. As it turned out, there was an unusually high percentage of male trainees during the year of the study, and a small percentage of the women who participated either filled out the instrument incorrectly or failed to finish it. The final, usable sample of cases was 81.

Criterion data. The criterion data collected from the subjects consisted of their responses (1) to the final two sections of the DSCCS: A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH and A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH; and (2) to a questionnaire asking them to assess (a) their overall ability to relate to children, on a three-step scale: Very Good, Good, and Fair (each step being defined in terms of the amount of work they felt they still needed in this area of their preparation as teachers); (b) their preferences for working with children of different ages (i.e., below 2, 2 through 4 years; 5 through 7 years; 8 through 10 years; 11 years and older); (c) their preference for work in different kinds of schools (e.g., public or private); (d) their sense of relative competence in working with outgoing, assertive, active children vs. shy, withdrawn, and passive children; and (e) their feelings of effectiveness with intellectually gifted children vs. children who are slow learners. (The questionnaire is presented in Appendix B.)

The criterion data obtained from the advisors consisted of their responses to a questionnaire concerning each of their students who had participated as a subject in the study. In terms of areas covered, this questionnaire roughly paralleled that filled out by the subjects. The advisors, however, were asked to rate the subjects' overall ability to relate to children on a four-step (rather than a three-step) scale: Outstanding, Good, Fair, Poor (again, each step was defined in terms that included the amount of work needed by the subject in this area). In addition, the advisors were asked to assess the subjects in terms of their effectiveness with children of different ages and in public vs. private schools, whereas the students had been asked about their personal preferences in these areas. (The questionnaire filled out by advisors is presented in Appendix C.)

Data Analysis

The study data consisted of

(1) the subjects' ratings on five sets of scales from the DSCCS, four of which yielded ratings on the same 60 dimensions (i.e., MYSELF NOW; MYSELF AS A CHILD; A CHILD I HAVE MOST ENJOYED WORKING WITH; A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH); and the fifth set of scales, FAMILY RELATIONS, which yielded ratings on 8 dimensions.

(2) the subjects' responses to a questionnaire covering their preferences for and feelings of competence in relation to several areas of their work with children (outlined above);[1] and

(3) advisors' responses to a questionnaire concerning their students' (the subjects') performance in working with children (outlined above).

All the above data were coded for analysis by computer. For this purpose, we assigned scores from 1 through 6 to the scale points on the DSCCS. Where a positive or preferred end point was clear-cut (e.g., loved vs. unloved; secure vs. insecure), the higher score was assigned to the positive end. However, for some items this criterion did not apply (e.g., practical vs. imaginative; defies authority vs. respects authority). Therefore, a higher score does not necessarily indicate a more positive or preferred scale position.

In order to provide tests of the hypotheses and to carry out the supplementary analyses, the DSCCS scores yielded by the different criterion groups were subjected to chi-square tests.[2] Because of small expected frequencies, the three

---

1. The analyses based on the subjects' responses to this questionnaire involve an N that is smaller than the original number of subjects because of a slight attrition in the sample at the criterion phase of the study; and in the case of certain analyses, minor categories were eliminated from consideration (i.e., in those involving public vs. private schools, categories of "day care" and "other" were omitted).

2. Nonparametric statistics are the only appropriate techniques for application across all the DSCCS scales.

adjoining cells on each side of the DSCCS items were collapsed (i.e., 6,5,4 and 3,2,1), and the analysis was applied to the score totals. This meant that for statistical purposes we had to omit consideration of differences in relative intensity (e.g., very capable, somewhat capable, etc.) and test for group differences in direction (e.g., capable vs. helpless).

Tests of the study hypotheses were provided as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Adults who are judged to develop effective relations with children perceive their childhood selves more positively on more dimensions than do adults who are judged to develop poor relations with children.

The primary test of this hypothesis entailed comparison of the subjects judged by their advisors to be Outstanding in their relations with children and those judged to be only Fair or Poor in these relations[1] on each of the 60 DSCCS items applied to the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD. (Further comparisons were also made, as described in Results and Discussion.)

Hypothesis 2: Adults who are judged as being most effective with preschool children, primary grade children, and upper elementary children perceive their childhood selves differently from one another.

Subjects judged by their advisors to be most effective at each age level were to be compared on the 60 DSCCS items as applied to the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD and on the 8 FAMILY RELATIONS items, but an unanticipated distribution among the criterion groups precluded carrying out this analysis (see Results and Discussion).

Hypothesis 3: Adults who are judged as working more effectively with outgoing, assertive, active children perceive their childhood selves differently

---

1. It was necessary to combine these two groups (both of which were judged to have marked difficulties in their relations with children) in order to increase the number of subjects for purposes of statistical comparison.

from adults who are judged as being more effective with shy, withdrawn, passive children, the differing self-perceptions paralleling the characteristics of the children with whom each group works best.

Subjects judged by their advisors as working more effectively with outgoing, assertive, active children were compared with subjects who were judged as being more effective with children who are on the shy, withdrawn, passive side on the 60 items as applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD.

Hypothesis 4: The characteristics of children whom adults subjectively feel they can work with most effectively are more closely related to the characteristics such adults attribute to their own childhood selves than are the characteristics of children with whom the adults feel they can work least effectively.

Three separate sets of analyses were carried out as tests of this hypothesis. The first two dealt directly with the criterion of feeling effective with children who display certain coping styles or characteristics; the third analysis dealt with the criterion of enjoyment in relation to actual children rather than types.

In the first two sets of analyses, ratings on the 60 DSCCS items applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD were compared with respect to (1) subjects who indicated that they felt more effective in working with outgoing, assertive, active children and subjects who said they felt more effective in working with shy, withdrawn, passive children; and (2) subjects who said they felt more effective working with intellectually gifted children and those subjects who said they felt more effective in working with children who are slow learners or have specific learning difficulties.

The third set of analyses bearing on (but not providing a direct test of) the hypothesis compared each subject's rating of herself on each scale of the DSCCS as applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD and the subject's rating on the same scale as applied to the concept A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH and A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH.

Hypothesis 5: The adult's perceived childhood self is a better predictor of adult-child relations than is the perceived adult self.

All the analyses which were carried out in relation to the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD (in Hypotheses 1-4) were carried out in relation to the concept MYSELF NOW, and comparisons made of the DSCCS items that differentiated between the relevant criterion groups.

Supplementary analyses were carried out to investigate associations between the two sets of self-concept items and

(1) advisors' assessments of the subjects' relative abilities to work in public (inner-city) schools vs. private or independent schools;

(2) the subjects' own preferences in relation to public vs. private school settings;

(3) advisors' judgments of subjects' effectiveness with gifted children and with children who are slow learners or who have specific learning difficulties;

(4) the subjects' preferences with respect to working with children of different age levels;

(5) the subjects' own assessments of their overall ability to relate to children.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section is divided into two parts. In the first part the results are presented and discussed with respect to each hypothesis. In the second part the results of each of the supplementary analyses are presented, with discussion included where appropriate.

The Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Adults who are judged to develop effective relations with children perceive their childhood selves more positively on more dimensions than do adults who are judged to develop poor relations with children.

The childhood self. As indicated above, the analysis bearing most directly on this hypothesis involved a comparison of the childhood self concepts of subjects judged by their advisors as being Outstanding in their relations with children (i.e., as virtually needing no further work in this area) and of those judged as Fair or Poor (i.e., as needing considerable work in the area of their relations with children or as being psychologically unsuited to relate to children at all).

Table 1 (the items with asterisks) shows that the Outstanding group differed significantly from the Fair/Poor group on six scales of the DSCCS applied to the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD. Examination of the actual distribution of scores on these scales shows (1) that the Outstanding group tended to view their childhood selves as strongly loved; and the Fair/Poor, as less loved or actually unloved; (2) that the Outstanding group perceived their childhood selves as comfortable; and the Fair/Poor group, most frequently as ill-at-ease; (3) that the Outstanding group viewed their childhood selves as responsible; and the Fair/Poor group, as neither very responsible nor very carefree; (4) that the Outstanding group attributed to their childhood selves a respect for authority; and the Fair/Poor group,

a tendency to defy authority; (5) that the Fair/Poor group recalled themselves as being in an instructing role as children, while the Outstanding group recalled being neither very instructing nor very instructed; and (6) that the Fair/Poor group viewed their childhood selves either as very competitive or as noncompetitive, while the Outstanding group viewed themselves fairly consistently as mildly competitive.

To illuminate these specific differences and gain an overall picture of the relative self-perceptions of all three groups--the Outstanding (O), the Good (G), and the Fair/Poor (F/P)--across all dimensions, we calculated the mean scores for each group on each of the 60 scales as applied to the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD and, based on that score, assigned a rank of 1, 2, or 3 to each group (see Table 1).[1] Examination of these ranks reveals that a perfect sequence, i.e., 1(O), 2(G), 3(F/P) or 3(O), 2(G), 1(F/P) occurs on 33 (or 55%) of the 60 scales.[2] On the basis of chance, we would expect a perfect sequence in only 20 (or 33%) of the cases. Although, as emphasized earlier, the highest score, and therefore a rank of 1, does not necessarily indicate the most positive or preferred scale position, this trend does suggest that a substantial number of characteristics attributed to the childhood self by the subjects, systematically increased or decreased in intensity with their rated ability to develop good relations with children.

Close examination of Table 1 shows that on those scales that have clear-cut positive or preferred end-points, the Fair/Poor group had far more negative child-

---

1. Mean scores were employed as a device for making these rough comparisons because they made the most use of the available data. At the same time, they clearly do violence to the nature of some of the findings, and where this is the case, reference is made to the actual distribution of scores.

2. Included among the items showing a perfect sequence are the six items that significantly differentiated between the Outstanding and the Fair/Poor groups.

hood self-ratings than either of the other groups, especially across items that reflect attitudes and feelings that are theoretically basic to healthy personality development in childhood; that the Outstanding group was the most positive in this respect; and that the group rated Good was generally in-between.

Specifically, compared to the other two groups, the Outstanding subjects described their childhood selves as more deeply rooted in basic feelings of love, security and trust; as more active, confident and able to cope; as more responsible, resourceful, efficient, and yet flexible and patient--in general as having a greater sense of mastery. Consistent with this overall positive self-characterization, this group recalled being more (psychologically) comfortable and harmonious, as well as more optimistic than either of the other groups.

The group judged to be Good in their relations with children also presented a predominantly positive picture of their childhood selves, ranking first on attributes such as influential, popular, leader, extroverted, cheerful, bright, and humorous. But coexisting with this favorable self-image was their feeling of being least self-reliant, least independent and most oversensitive.

Finally, the Fair/Poor group assessed their childhood selves farthest from the end-points of the scales that reflected basic feelings of love, security, mastery, psychological comfort and optimism, and conveyed instead a picture of storminess, aggressiveness, and assertive-defiance accompanied by (underlying) feelings of loneliness.

A comparison of these trends with those found in the study that generated Hypothesis 1 (Rosen, 1968) shows striking similarities.[1] Further, the clusters of items characterizing the childhood selves of the present groups, as later elucidated, make psychological sense. Moreover, when these clusters are viewed in

---

1. For a summation of the 1968 findings, see Background, p. 6.

relation to other sets of data obtained from the present subjects, it is possible to see how the childhood self may act as a dynamic force, influencing the quality of the prospective teacher's relations with children. Toward this end, we will examine, first, how the subjects described their relations within their families of origin and, second, how they view themselves now as young adults on the brink of becoming teachers.

Family relations. As indicated above, the clusters of items characterizing the childhood selves of the three groups did not at all appear to be random, but instead made psychological sense. This contention is supported by the ways in which the three groups tended to characterize their relations with their families in the course of growing up, as shown (with certain exceptions indicated below) by the mean ranks in Table 2.

Beginning with the Fair/Poor group, we find that these subjects viewed their parents as being least supportive, least understanding, most punitive, and (when we move from the ranks to the actual distribution of scores) as either setting many limits or almost none at all. (On this scale none placed her parents at the midpoints, 3 or 4.) Further, of the three groups, they saw their families as being least warm and closely-knit; relatively few of them (29%) felt "extremely" close to either parent (none felt this way toward her father); and, to a greater extent than the other groups, they have rejected their parents' values. This relatively negative picture of family relations is clearly consistent with this group's portrayal of their childhood selves as feeling least loved, least trusting, and least secure; as most ill-at-ease, most tense, most conflicted, most lonely, and most pessimistic, as well as (it is assumed, defensively) most broadly aggressive and defiant.

If the above characteristics of family relations and of the childhood self

were to be couched in opposing terms, they would closely approximate much of what was found in the Outstanding group. This latter group viewed their families as most warm, close-knit, as seldom punishing them; and while the mean ranks suggest that they viewed their parents as setting the fewest limits on their behavior, examination of the distribution of their scores across all six points on the scale shows that they viewed their parents as neither setting many limits nor very few. Furthermore, the majority (64%) of this group felt extremely close to one parent or the other (44% to their mothers and 20% to their fathers). And it was this group that felt their current values to be closest to the values they learned from their parents in the course of growing up. In parallel, this positive view of family relations is also consistent with this group's picture of their childhood selves as feeling most loved, most trusting, and most secure; as most psychologically comfortable and harmonious and, perhaps also (since there was, theoretically, little to defy) most respectful of authority.

Finally, the group rated as Good in their relations with children viewed their parents as almost always understanding them, as almost always giving them support and good advice and, at the same time, as setting the most limits on their behavior. These attributed characteristics combine to suggest that this group perceived their parents as overprotective. This interpretation is consistent with the finding that members of this group, while presenting a generally positive picture of their childhood selves, felt less self-reliant and less independent than the other two groups and it provides a basis for explaining why (as discussed later) they reported rebelling most actively against their parents in the course of growing up.

The self at present. Finally, we will enlarge on the evolving dynamic pictures of the three groups by looking at how their relative positions on the DSCCS scales were altered when they were applied to MYSELF NOW. What, in fact, are

the relative group changes in the phenomenological self when we compare the self recalled from childhood with the concept of the self at present, as young women about to enter the teaching profession?

Comparing the mean ranks of MYSELF NOW (Table 3) and those of MYSELF AS A CHILD (Table 1), we find the following:

The Outstanding group retains its rank on the vast majority of the basically positive characteristics which they attributed to their childhood selves. They still feel most loved, most secure, and so on. The best characterization of the new (first-rank) elements entering into their self-image at present is that of a sense of maturing and of being realistic. Whereas they viewed their childhood selves (compared with the other groups) as young for their age, they now see themselves as old for their age; and a shift from most optimistic to least optimistic is accompanied by an increased sense of the self as rational, bright, and self-reliant. And in this connection, they continue to rank first in viewing themselves as giving and patient.

In their portrayal of MYSELF NOW, the Fair/Poor group drops from its primary rank on the attributes that together might be labeled an "aggressive, defiant syndrome." No longer are they most bossy, defiant of authority, rebellious, aggressive, tough, self-reliant, or independent; on most of these attributes they in fact rank last. They continue to be the most spontaneous, outgoing, and stormy and, relative to the other groups, more fighters than peacemakers, but by and large, the dominant air of spirited aggressive rebelliousness no longer characterizes this group. They still feel the least loved, the least self-confident and most ill-at-ease, but--inexplicably--they have moved from last place to first place in optimism and sense of humor.

The aggressive, defiant syndrome that characterized the childhood selves of the Fair/Poor group can now be found in the present self-concept of the group

which was rated Good. Indeed, while members of this latter group still rank first in their views of themselves as influential, dominant, and leaders, the new elements entering into their self-portrayal are defiance of authority, bossiness, rebelliousness, and aggressiveness. At the same time they now move into the third rank in their sense of trust and security.

Preliminary formulation. With these group trends in mind, we can develop a preliminary formulation of the broad dynamic issues that may be operating in the personality differences among the three groups and suggest the potential consequences of these dynamics for the quality of the relations they developed with children.

The Outstanding group can be viewed as having the most secure sense of self --and, more broadly, the most well-established ego identity--their sense of their childhood selves is anchored in the experience of feeling loved, secure, and trusting, and they convey a feeling of mastery of themselves and of their worlds that is internally consistent. More specifically, the ways in which they described themselves and their intrafamilial relations suggests their sense of having moved from one developmental stage to the next with a relative sureness and availability of conflict-free ego energy to apply to productive endeavors and, correspondingly, with the building of a sense of self-esteem in connection with a wide span of maturing ego functions. The portrayal of their early family life as warm, close-knit, their parents as setting neither too many limits nor too few, of being non-punitive--all of this presumably, precluded any substantial need to rebel but instead created conditions for the integration or consolidation of (what they perceived to be positive) parental values into their own developing personalities into young adulthood. On the basis of how they viewed themselves, these are warm, related, effective young women with so solid a sense of where they have come from, and of who they are, that they have a great deal available

to give to children. Theoretically, they would have the capacity to join children in their fantasy life, and have fun with them, because positive feelings from their own childhoods are available to use with children. At the same time, members of this group seem to have established a sufficient sense of their own identity as adults not to fear losing that identity in permitting their childhood selves temporarily to take over in the service of understanding and relating to children. Further, incorporated into that identity as an adult are values assimilated in the course of life-long relationships with adult models who provided both a warm, close environment for children and a sense of respect for them, as exemplified in the application of limits that were neither too rigid to suggest lack of trust nor too loose to convey disregard.

When we turn to the group rated Good, we find the subjects on middle ground vis-a-vis the other groups with respect to such basic developmental issues as a childhood sense of being loved, feeling secure and experiencing trust. While their portrayal of the childhood self is positive, they emphasize different strengths from those of the Outstanding group, conveying a popular, influential, leader image. At the same time, however, this positive self-view contrasts with their presentation of themselves as having felt more dependent than either of the other two groups during childhood. And this feeling, as noted earlier, may be associated with a view of their parents as overprotective. This group's recall of actively rebelling against their parents (presumably during adolescence) can be viewed as an effort to loosen their strong emotional ties to them; to overcome their childhood reliance on parental standards and support. Now, in presenting their current selves as the most defiant of authority, the most bossy, the most rebellious, the most aggressive, the most active, and the most competitive, we can conjecture that the dependence/independence conflict continues to be a focal issue for this group and that they are striving as they move into adulthood to

assert their independence boldly and broadly.

From a theoretical standpoint, then, the "good" relations that this group established with children can be understood in terms of their generally positive attitudes toward their childhoods, feelings about the childhood self that enable them to experience essentially positive attitudes toward children. But at the same time, their current active struggle to overcome their own feelings of over-dependence on the adult world is likely to constitute a source of difficulty in their work with children; and may explain why they were regarded as still needing work in their relations with children by the advisors. For such a conflict in the adult can be readily stimulated when children themselves display evidence of a dependence/independence conflict--normative or otherwise--manifested on the one hand, for example, by a direct assault on the adult's role as the authority or, on the other, through regressive, clinging behavior. In effect, still uncertain of their own identity as autonomous adults, the relations of members of this group with children may break down under conditions of perceived threat to their own authority role or of infantile demands by children that trigger off their own unresolved dependency needs.

Finally, within the framework of the foregoing analysis, it is possible to see why the group which was rated Fair/Poor in their relations with children manifested difficulties so serious that they were judged by their advisors to be either psychologically unsuited to work with children or as needing a great deal of work on this basic aspect of the teaching role. If our fundamental assumption is correct that the childhood self plays a crucial role in the ability of the adult to relate to children, serving as a resource for empathy with their feelings and needs, it is evident that this group of subjects came to the teaching role with relatively meager psychological supplies available for the task. Indeed, compared with their counterparts in the other two groups, these subjects portrayed

their childhood selves as least loved, least secure, least trusting, most distant, most ill-at-ease, least self-confident, least adequate; and these self-feelings have continued into adulthood. They also emphasized what can most readily be interpreted as an aggressive defiant stance in childhood--a "bravado" image to confront a world which they perceived--at least relative to the other groups--as unsupportive, if not frankly rejecting. For as recalled by these subjects, their parents were least understanding, least supportive, least often giving of good advice, most punishing, and either setting too few or too many limits on the subjects' behavior as they were growing up. Of the three groups, the members of this group viewed their families as most distant and loosely-knit, as opposed to warm and closely-knit. In brief, then, this group had relatively few resources--either in their subjective experiences as children or in terms of opportunities to identify with adult models who supported and respected them--to enable them, as prospective teachers, to respond empathically, yet objectively, to the needs of children in the classroom.

As an additional note to the general personality differences between the three groups that have concerned us here, it is of interest that the one DSCCS scale that directly relates to teaching, i.e., instructing vs. instructed, was found to be a significant predictor of teacher-child relations when it was applied to both concepts, MYSELF AS A CHILD and MYSELF NOW. We have noted earlier that with respect to the former concept the Fair/Poor group tended to view their childhood selves as instructing, while the Outstanding group tended to rank themselves toward the middle of the scale. The Fair/Poor group seems to have viewed their childhood selves as little teachers (of other children), while the Outstanding group either did not see this scale as relevant or they saw themselves as being about equally engaged in the teaching and learning processes.

In the case of MYSELF NOW, however, the Outstanding group did view themselves

as being more in the instructing than in the instructed role. This item, being one of only three items applied to the present self that differentiated significantly between the Outstanding and Fair/Poor groups, suggests that the finding may represent an emerging sense of professional identity in the Outstanding group, and even in the early stages of their training, a commitment to their prospective role as teachers.[1]

Hypothesis 2: Adults who are judged as being most effective with preschool children, with primary grade children, and with upper elementary children perceive their childhood selves differently from one another.

A totally unanticipated distribution of advisor ratings on the age level dimensions precluded an adequate test of this hypothesis. Specifically, while Bank Street has for over half a century had the reputation as a training institution for teachers of early childhood, only nine of the total sample of 81 subjects were judged by their advisors as working most effectively with this youngest age level. An earlier study (Rosen, 1972) had shown the strongest and most consistent trends among student teachers who were judged as working best with the age group below five years of age. Thus, the absence of a substantial number of subjects in this category is especially unfortunate for present purposes.

The presence of 25 subjects categorized as working best with the oldest age group (which is adequate for purposes of analysis) is of relatively minor value here. For in the earlier study, subjects judged as working most effectively with the oldest age group were found to vary widely in their personality attributes;

---

1. As shown in Table 3, the additional items that differentiated between the two groups on the present self-concept were stormy vs. placid and fast vs. slow. Taken in the context of other trends, such as that the Outstanding group viewed themselves as more patient, more giving, etc., these findings may reflect differences in temperament or pacing that are germane to the quality of relations that teachers develop with children.

and it seems reasonable to conclude, now, as then, that since older children are, on the whole, independent of their teacher as a source of emotional support, an upper elementary teacher who is able to foster the children's investment in the world of ideas can theoretically be effective, whether or not she has the kinds of basic personality resources that would seem critical for work with younger children.

As a parenthetical note, however, when we examined the ranks of the means of the three groups on the FAMILY RELATIONS scales of the DSCCS, it was found that the small group of subjects who were judged as working most effectively with the youngest age group paralleled their counterparts in the earlier study in basic ways. Compared with the other groups, members of this small group viewed their parents as being most often understanding, as offering them the most support and good advice, as setting the fewest limits, and as least seldom punishing them. This globally positive view of their child-parent relations is, in fact, directly reminiscent of the conclusions drawn about their counterparts in the earlier study: "The areas of gratification that this group appeared to value most in writing about their childhood lives [were] being given security, support, and values on which they could depend by parents and other significant adults, as well as being provided with limitless opportunities to move out and explore their worlds with a sense of sureness and safety" (p. 424). These trends are of interest because they parallel earlier findings; however, they must at this stage be considered merely suggestive because of the sample limitations described above, and because these are findings of relative ranks rather than of substantial differences.

Hypothesis 3: Adults who are judged as working more effectively with outgoing, assertive, active children perceive their childhood selves differently from adults who are judged as being more effective with shy, withdrawn, passive children, the differing self-perceptions paralleling the characteristics of the

children with whom each group works best.

Analysis of the data bearing on this hypothesis, in which assessments of subject effectiveness were supplied by the advisors (rather than by the subjects themselves, as in the analysis to follow), revealed that five of the DSCCS scales applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD differentiated between the relevant groups at or beyond the .05 level (see Table 4). Of these scales, the most directly relevant as a test of the hypothesis is spontaneous vs. reserved. And here the results are in the predicted direction with the group describing the childhood self as more spontaneous being assessed by their advisors as more effective with outgoing, assertive, active children and the group describing the childhood self as more on the reserved side being assessed by their advisors as more effective with children who are shy, withdrawn, and passive. However, the fact that the latter group perceived the childhood self as being brave does not appear to support the hypothesis (and stands in stark contrast to the findings bearing on the hypothesis to follow). That the group judged as working more effectively with outgoing, assertive, active children viewed themselves as more carefree and the other group as more responsible is equivocal. A carefree attitude may be conceived as more psychologically consistent with outgoingness than with a tendency toward shyness. But a sense of responsibility could be construed as consonant with either of the dispositions attributed to the childhood self. As for the more patient and giving attributes ascribed to the childhood self by those who were judged as working best with shy, withdrawn, passive children--these findings, too, must be considered equivocal in terms of their support of the hypothesis.

When we examined the ranks of the means of the two groups, we found overall but not entirely consistent support for the hypothesis. For example, those who were judged to work best with outgoing, assertive, active children, as compared with the other group, viewed their childhood selves as more defiant of authority,

bossy, self-confident, competitive, boisterous, leader, friendly, happy-go-lucky, unselfconscious, impulsive, coping, sense of humor, fast, warm, aggressive, extroverted, cheerful, dominant, tough, and fighter. These trends are clearly consistent with the hypothesis with respect to the outgoing, assertive qualities of children. However, the mean rank of the group judged as working best with shy, withdrawn, passive children was closer to the active end of the active-passive scale than was that of their "outgoing" counterparts.

In general, we conclude that there is more support in favor of this hypothesis than against it, but the evidence is only suggestive.

Hypothesis 4: The characteristics of children whom adults subjectively feel they can work with most effectively are more closely related to the characteristics such adults attribute to their own childhood selves than are the characteristics of children with whom the adults feel they can work least effectively.

As indicated in Methods, a direct test of this hypothesis was carried out with respect to two sets of characteristics in children: (1) those who tend more towards being outgoing, assertive, and active and those who are more on the shy, withdrawn, passive side (the same characteristics involved in Hypothesis 3, but with the criterion judgments here being supplied by the subjects themselves as in the child-care worker study); and (2) those children who are intellectually gifted and those who are slow learners or have specific learning difficulties.

With respect to the first set of characteristics, analysis of the data revealed that subjects who experienced a greater sense of competence in working with outgoing, assertive, active children viewed their childhood selves as significantly more brave, bossy, self-reliant, coping, and extroverted. By the same token, the subjects who felt more competent in relation to shy, withdrawn, passive children perceived their childhood selves as more fearful, unassertive, dependent, avoiding and introverted. Taken on their own merits, these statistically signif-

icant differences between the groups contribute strong support to the hypothesis (see Table 5).

When we add to these findings the trends that are revealed by an examination of the ranks of the means of the two groups, support for the hypothesis is increased. For here it can be observed that on virtually all the related characteristics, those ascribed to the childhood self are in the predicted direction, even the essential characteristics in question: outgoing vs. shy, bossy vs. unassertive, active vs. passive.

It will be recalled that the overall hypothesis which these data support was generated by the findings from the child-care worker study (Rosen, 1963), and in particular, those dealing with the workers' feelings of relative competence vis-a-vis aggressive, outgoing children and shy, withdrawn children. In that study, it was found that the "aggressive-child selectors" (those workers who felt most competent in working with children who are predominantly outgoing and aggressive) described themselves as having been outgoing and aggressive children, and the "withdrawn-child selectors" described themselves as having been relatively shy and withdrawn. The aggressive-child selectors pictured their childhood selves as having been physically active, as liking to be with people, as readily expressing feelings, as too busy to think about serious things, as competitive with peers; and the withdrawn-child selectors described themselves as physically passive, shy, compliant, as keeping feelings to themselves, as preferring quiet or solitary activities.

Perusal of the relative ranks of the means of the two present groups with respect to the childhood self characterizations reveals relationships that are supportive of the child-care worker findings across a range of self-assessments, e.g., the present subjects who felt more competent with outgoing, assertive children pictured themselves as relatively more active, more friendly, boisterous,

impulsive, happy-go-lucky, playful, competitive, and the subjects who felt more competent with shy, withdrawn children viewed their childhood selves as more passive, shy, respectful of authority, conforming, controlled, introverted, and quiet.

The importance of the consistency of these trends with those found in the study of the child-care workers is underscored by some further parallels found between the present and earlier study. These emerge when we examine certain dimensions of recalled relations within their families:

The "aggressive-child selectors," in Rosen (1963), when asked what they had liked most regarding parental treatment, most frequently recalled participating in activities together as a family; and when asked what they had liked least, virtually all of them mentioned an abundance of whippings and overstrictness. By contrast, the "withdrawn-child selectors" omitted reference to family activities as a source of pleasurable recall; and none of them mentioned discipline as a disliked treatment, some recalling actively having longed for discipline.

In parallel, the mean rank of the present group of subjects who felt most competent with outgoing, assertive children was closer to the end-points of the scales indicating the recall of their families as being "warm, close-knit," as setting more limits on their behavior, and as punishing them more frequently.

The various trends found in the present analysis, from those that reflected substantial differences between the groups to those that were merely suggestive, were so consistent with the child-care worker findings that we are forced to conclude that real personality differences do in fact underly the adult's feeling of competence in working with children who are outgoing and assertive vs. those who are shy and withdrawn. And we are therefore led to consider again the formulation that was suggested in the study of child-care workers regarding the possible origins of such personality differences and their implications for those

feelings of competence. For even though the child-care worker study was carried out in the context of work with institutionalized, severely emotionally disturbed children and the present study is in a context of work with "normal" children, the same basic dynamics may well operate in the adult.

In that study (Rosen, 1963) it was postulated that the "aggressive-child selector" could understand and accept the child who dealt with his conflicts by displaying aggression, since the worker had experienced such tendencies himself as a child and had accepted these tendencies as part of himself. Further, he could understand the aggressive child's search for limits and the relief when these were imposed because he was able to remember similar feelings. He also felt certain of his ability to set necessary limits for the child because during his own childhood he had adult models who valued and imposed discipline. This worker, having grown up accustomed to action and interaction, felt on solid ground with the child whom he could engage in action-oriented group activities. Moreover, his own patterns of expressing feeling, whether motor or verbal, had been direct and assertive, and he relied on these modes of expression in the child for an understanding of the child's needs. But the withdrawn child, who could not express himself so directly, was a psychological stranger to this worker, and the worker tended to feel thwarted and inadequate in his efforts to work with him.

The "withdrawn-child selector," however, felt better able to understand the child who tended to isolate himself from others, keep his feelings to himself, and avoid action, for this worker himself could recall having experienced in kind, if not in degree, similar tendencies during his own childhood. Through empathy with this child, he was able to accept the child's withdrawal and passivity, and felt no push either to direct the child into active, organized programs or to have the child express his feelings and needs directly. But this worker felt frankly threatened by the aggressive child. He feared directly the child's potential for

inflicting physical harm, and he also feared that he himself might lose control of feelings stimulated by the child's behavior. It appeared that this worker who had not experienced even minor physical punishment at the hands of his parents had come to feel that physical restraint of a child might contain destructive potential. Thus, he was anxious about his ability to provide protection for the child or for himself, should this be necessary. Moreover, because this worker had had little parental direction and firmness, he had not developed the sense of certainty that well-defined expectations provide in the course of growing up; and thus found himself unable to define situations and set consistent limits for the aggressive child who, by his behavior, demanded that the worker do so. Having little basis for empathy with the aggressive child, he tended to view the child's behavior as malicious rather than symptomatic, and responded to him with rejection and withdrawal.

Clearly, our prospective teachers have not been confronted on a day-to-day basis with the extremes of aggressiveness and withdrawal that the child-care workers faced. They could not, therefore, have had so firmly fixed in their minds personal knowledge of the concrete behavioral manifestations involved in selecting which of the two types of children they felt most competent in working with. And, in fact, in drawing up the dichotomy of behaviors to which they were asked to respond, we softened "aggressive," changing it to "assertive" in order to rule out the extreme or pathological connotations of the former term. That these modifications in the conditions of the present study did not alter the kinds of trends that were found in the child-care worker study is especially noteworthy. And while in general we would not anticipate that our present subjects will have to deal on a day-to-day basis with feelings aroused by the extremes of behavior that the child-care workers struggled with, the dichotomy of behaviors--outgoing, assertive, active, and shy, withdrawn, passive--is nevertheless relevant

to teachers. To the extent that it is relevant for a particular classroom, or school, the formulation offered in relation to the child-care workers may provide broad guidelines for understanding variations in teachers' experiences of confidence and competence as they relate to children in their work.

With regard to the second set of characteristics pertinent to the overall hypothesis--that pertaining to children who are intellectually gifted vs. those who are slow learners or who have specific learning difficulties--the analysis of the responses to the concept, MYSELF AS A CHILD, yielded reliable differences on six scales. Among these (as shown in Table 6) the most directly relevant finding --and, in fact, the most relevant finding possible in support of the hypothesis-- was that the subjects who indicated a greater sense of competence with gifted children viewed their childhood selves as gifted significantly more often than did those subjects who felt more competent in relation to slow learners or to children with specific learning difficulties.

Further differences were revealed as follows: Those subjects feeling more competent with gifted children perceived their childhood selves as more competitive and more as peacemakers than fighters; as less self-confident, less independent, and more sober (vs. happy-go-lucky) than did the group who chose slow learning children or those with specific learning difficulties.

While it is possible to see why people who view themselves as gifted might tend to feel competitive and sober, rather than happy-go-lucky (e.g., they may feel they have something to contribute to the world and have to get on with it), no ready explanation comes to mind with respect to the other correlates of the self-perception of giftedness--lesser self-confidence and independence than the other group, and some tendency to be peacemakers rather than fighters. Whether the sense of being gifted or ordinary is the cause or effect of a particular set of personality dynamics or covaries with it is not a matter on which we can

speculate, given the data that we have. The main conclusion to be drawn at present is simply that the feeling of having been a gifted child is more closely associated with a sense of competence in working with gifted children than it is with children who have difficulty learning; that a feeling of competence with these latter children is more likely to be found in prospective teachers who view their childhood selves as more "ordinary" than "gifted," and that these associations are probably mediated by a process of empathic identification with the cognitive needs and coping styles in point.

In sum, these two sets of analyses which concerned subjective feelings of competence in relation to children with differing characteristics provide substantial support for Hypothesis 4.

The third set of analyses bearing on the overall hypothesis (though not providing a direct test of it) concerned feelings of enjoyment rather than of competence or effectiveness in working with children. This analysis was based on the subjects' ratings of a particular child with whom they had especially enjoyed working (and then of a child with whom they had least enjoyed working) on the 60 DSCCS items rather than, as before, on a simple choice between two categories reflecting opposing characteristics, presented in isolation from the context of individual children. The process of analyses was also substantially different from that entailed in the previous two analyses. Here the subjects' ratings of the most- and least-enjoyed child were ordered into tables which would allow for direct comparison of the ratings of the child-most-enjoyed (and of the child-least-enjoyed) with those of the subjects' childhood self on each of the DSCCS items.

Inspection of these tables--120 in all--revealed nothing significant. There was no evidence indicating that when prospective teachers are asked to conjure up the image of a child with whom they have especially enjoyed working (and then of one with whom they have least enjoyed working), the characteristics of that child,

as perceived by the subjects, are systematically associated with similar (or dissimilar) characteristics of their perceived childhood selves.

The absence of associations resulting from this analysis stands in striking contrast to the findings in the two previous analyses. Is this because the data on which the previous analyses were based had involved the concept of effectiveness rather than of enjoyment? Possibly--but in the child-care worker study, the workers not only felt most competent with, but also liked best and in general felt most positively toward children in whom they perceived characteristics that turned out to be similar to those they perceived in their childhood selves. It is unlikely, therefore, that the lack of associations resulting from the third set of analyses, as compared with the positive findings resulting from the first two sets, is attributable to a difference in emphasis from the experience of effectiveness to that of enjoyment.

Perhaps, then, the explanation for the inconsistency of findings lies in the differential nature of the tasks posed for the subjects, where in the first two instances they had to choose between alternative categories reflecting "types" of children and, in the third, they had to think of a specific child and then characterize him or her.

But, again, the child-care worker study would suggest that this explanation is inadequate. The child-care workers' characterizations of specific children toward whom they felt positively (and toward whom they felt negatively) were found to be strikingly similar (and dissimilar, respectively) to their characterizations of their childhood selves.

The most reasonable explanation of the inconsistency appears to lie in differences between the child-care workers' and the present subjects' opportunity to know, and to become affectively involved with individual children in their work.

The child-care workers were functioning in an institution in which they both

lived and worked with children in what was tantamount to an extended family; and the workers (as surrogate parents) were responsible in large part for the physical and emotional needs of the children in their care. Furthermore, they participated in frequent clinical conferences in which the behavior and the needs of each of the (24) children were the subject of ongoing discussion and analysis. In addition, because the children were emotionally disturbed, they tended to express their needs and defensive patterns in extreme degrees, adding perhaps to the workers' ability to characterize individual children with relative ease. And, finally, every worker had developed strong positive feelings toward at least one child and strong negative feelings toward another at the time the study was carried out. Thus, the essential elements of both knowledge and feeling concerning the children were present in the workers in "ideal" form for purposes of studying their reactions to the individual children in their care.

It can be assumed that, as a group, the subjects in the present study had no parallel reservoir of knowledge and feeling about individual children with whom they had worked. They had no uniformly comparable resources for either selecting or characterizing a child with whom they had "especially enjoyed working" and one with whom they had "least enjoyed working." The only universal source of work experience which they had had was as student teachers in two or three different master teachers' classrooms (over the course of seven months), meaning that many of them had had little opportunity to work intensively with enough children on an individual basis to develop strong feelings toward them--either positive or negative--or to gain differentiated knowledge of individual children. (It is noted in this regard that several subjects complained in filling out the DSCCS that they were having difficulty thinking of an appropriate child; and some said that they had resorted to using an amalgam of two or more children.)

If it is true that a substantial number of subjects had not developed

especially strong feelings--positive or negative--toward individual children, or if they had not grown to know the children whom they were describing intimately enough so that they could break down and analyze on the spot which characteristics were salient, which were less relevant, and which were of no relevance at all, then there would be no expectation of associations between the DSCCS ratings of the children and those of the childhood self. While we cannot say with certainty that this was the case, in view of the previous two sets of positive findings (where the criterion choices could be made on the basis of a lifetime of contacts with children, from the casual to the prolonged) and of those found in the child-care worker study we offer this explanation as a tentative conclusion, awaiting further study of the issue.

Hypothesis 5: The adult's perceived childhood self is a better predictor of adult-child relations than is the perceived adult self.

As indicated in the Methods section, all the relationships that were examined in the first four hypotheses, using the childhood self as a predictor, were examined again using MYSELF NOW as the predictor. A test of Hypothesis 5, then, consisted of a count of the scales that served to differentiate between the criterion groups covered by each of the above four hypotheses.

As shown in Table 7, a simple count of the statistically significant differences found using the 60 DSCCS scales applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD, as compared to those applied to MYSELF NOW, revealed the following:

With reference to Hypothesis 1, employing MYSELF AS A CHILD as predictor, six scales of the DSCCS differentiated reliably between the Outstanding and Fair/Poor groups; using MYSELF NOW, three scales differentiated between these groups.

Examining Hypothesis 2, as indicated above, the paucity of subjects who were categorized by their advisors as being most effective with the youngest age group made it impossible to provide a valid test of the hypothesis concerning effective-

ness with children of differing ages. Therefore, the data bearing on Hypothesis 2 cannot be used as evidence to help support or refute the present hypothesis concerned with the relative value of the childhood self-concept and the present self-concept as predictors of adult-child relations.

As for Hypothesis 3, analysis of the childhood self yielded reliable differences on five of the DSCCS scales with respect to the criterion--advisor judgments of effectiveness with outgoing, assertive, active children vs. effectiveness with children who are shy, withdrawn, and passive. MYSELF NOW yielded only one such scale. While a single significant difference out of a possible 60 is less than what would be expected on the basis of chance alone, in this case the finding cannot be readily dismissed, for it suggests that subjects who are judged as working most effectively with outgoing children also tend to view their current selves as outgoing; while those judged as most effective with shy children tend to view themselves in parallel fashion.

Turning next to the results described in relation to Hypothesis 4, the first criterion--self-evaluation of competence with outgoing, assertive, active children vs. children who are shy, withdrawn, and passive--was "predicted" by five DSCCS scales applied to the childhood self. When these results were compared with those that emerged in relation to MYSELF NOW, it was found that for the first time this latter concept yielded the greater number of significant scales, with nine items differentiating between the criterion groups. Moreover, these nine scales included the three that are most directly relevant; and these were associated with the criterion in the same manner as those predicted in relation to the childhood self; i.e., those subjects who felt more competent with outgoing, assertive, active children significantly more often than their counterparts rated MYSELF NOW as outgoing, bossy, and active. Thus, with respect to this dimension, the current self was a better predictor of adult-child relations than was the self-as-child.

The second criterion--self-evaluation of competence with gifted vs. slow-learning children or children who have specific learning difficulties--was "predicted" by six of the scales assessing MYSELF AS A CHILD. Only one scale--gifted vs. ordinary--applied to MYSELF NOW differentiated reliably between the criterion groups, but again (as with Hypothesis 3), this one scale cannot readily be disregarded as a chance phenomenon, for out of the 60 scales, this single scale is germane; and those subjects who felt most competent with gifted children conceived of their current selves as being more gifted than did those subjects who felt their competence lay in work with slow-learning children.

The third set of analyses bearing on Hypothesis 4 revealed, through inspection, no significant relationships between the childhood self and the characteristics of the child-most-enjoyed or of the child-least-enjoyed; and the same lack of relationship was observed with respect to MYSELF NOW.

In sum, a count of the DSCCS scales applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD vs. the same scales applied to MYSELF NOW suggests that the former concept is, by and large, a better predictor of adult-child relations than is the latter concept. However, the concept MYSELF NOW does have some relevance as a predictor of adult-child relations--the possible implications (and limitations) of which are discussed in the final section of this report.

Supplementary Analyses

The first two sets of analyses reported in this section deal with a new dimension--public vs. private school. In the first of these sets of analyses, we focus on advisor judgments of their students' relative effectiveness in these settings and the relationship between these judgments and the subjects' concepts of their childhood selves and of their present selves. In the second set, we examine the subjects' own preferences for work in these settings and how these preferences relate to their childhood and present self-concepts.

The remaining analyses serve to fill in either advisor judgments or the subjects' own self-evaluations where these were not examined previously. Specifically, under the hypotheses we investigated the subjects' preferences for work with gifted children vs. slow learners, but not the advisors' judgments of their effectiveness on this dimension. Thus, an analysis based on these latter judgments is included in this section. The additional dimensions covered are the subjects' age-level preferences and the subjects' self-evaluations of their competence to relate to children in general.

1. Advisor judgments of effectiveness in public vs. private schools. The first analysis in this set investigated associations between the criterion judgments and the subjects' ratings of MYSELF AS A CHILD. The results were striking indeed: 13 of the 60 DSCCS scales differentiated between the two groups at or beyond the .05 level of significance--a substantially greater number than was the case in any of the analyses which tested the hypotheses.

Examination of these differences (see Table 8) reveals that the "public school" group viewed their childhood selves as more secure, self-confident, extroverted, influential, fast and, in general, more action-oriented than did those subjects in the "private school" group; and further that the former group perceived their childhood selves as more concrete and logical, while the latter group saw their childhood selves as more abstract and intuitive.

The second analysis examined the same criterion of relative effectiveness in relation to MYSELF NOW (Table 8). Here the analysis revealed that 4 scales differentiated reliably between the groups. The "public school" group viewed their present selves as more happy-go-lucky (vs. sober), more optimistic, more influential, and cool (vs. emotional) than their "private school" counterparts.

2. Subject preference for public vs. private school placement. With the subjects' own preferences for work setting as the criterion against the predictor

concept MYSELF AS A CHILD, it was found that 9 scales differentiated reliably between the "public school" and the "private school" groups (Table 8). And those preferring public school settings perceived their childhood selves similarly in certain respects to their "public school" group in the first analysis, i.e., as more secure, fast, and action-oriented than the "private school" group--and, again, as more logical (vs. intuitive). In the present analysis, members of the "public school" group also perceived their childhood selves as more loved, more instructing (vs. instructed), as more controlled (rather than impulsive), more as fighters (vs. peacemakers), and more optimistic.

Analysis of MYSELF NOW against the criterion of subject preference for work setting revealed three scales which differentiated significantly between the public and private school groups (Table 8). Here the former group viewed themselves as more optimistic, fast, and cool (vs. emotional). It will be noted that in the previous analysis using MYSELF NOW as predictor, optimistic and cool were also found to differentiate between the two groups.

We did not anticipate the strong relationships that emerged from these two sets of findings. Indeed, we did not even expect that such a sizeable number of student teachers from a training institution in New York City would elect to teach in inner-city public schools, given the well-publicized hardships that teachers are likely to encounter there. We especially did not anticipate such a response from student teachers at Bank Street College, who tend to apply for training at this institution because of its humanistic and individualistic educational philosophy--a philosophy which runs counter to basic educational practices of most of the city's public schools.

But we learned from Bank Street faculty that many students now have a deep commitment to public education and to the children from minority groups who predominate in the inner-city schools. Some want to change the system by becoming a

part of it--others are willing to adjust to the limitations imposed by this huge bureaucratic system simply because of their commitment to public education and because of a conviction that, whatever the drawbacks, they can have a positive impact on the lives of some of the children of poverty they encounter in the inner-city schools.

Most of the students who participated in the study had had placements in public and private schools during their training year, so that when they indicated their choice of school setting on the questionnaire, that choice was based on at least some understanding of the realities involved. Similarly, the advisors' judgments of their students' effectiveness was based on their observations of the students in their placements in these differing school settings.

But what of the private, or independent, schools? What major elements were involved for those students who indicated a preference for teaching in these institutions and for the advisors in judging that certain of their students would be more effective here?

The kinds of private schools with which students (and advisors) at Bank Street are most familiar place primary emphasis on a responsiveness to individual needs--cognitive and emotional--both with respect to children and teachers. These are the schools that are selected for student teaching placements. And it is these schools whose practices most closely express the educational philosophy of the College's training program.

How then can we make sense of the substantial differences in the self-concepts of subjects who chose to teach in public schools and those who chose to teach in private schools? And between those who were judged by their advisors as being more effective in one setting than in the other?

The findings with respect to both of these criterion measures suggest common

trends.[1] the two "public school" groups tend to picture the childhood self as loved, secure and confident, and with a sense of organized energy and down-to-earth action-orientation coupled with optimism. All of which suggests the combined resources of positive self-feelings from childhood being brought to bear on their relations with children; the toughness, practicality and self-confidence necessary to work within a large, impersonal system; and the optimism, past and present, to embrace the challenge of working in inner-city schools today.

By comparison, we find in the "private school" groups the presentation of a childhood self which is relatively passive and insecure, more responsive to the inner world of impulse and feeling than to the concrete, practical realities of outer-world demands and, overall, more pessimistic. Their preference for work in private schools (and their advisors' judgments of their greater effectiveness in these settings) would appear to have one or both of two basic determinants--first, a lack of the resources necessary to function in the relatively tough and impersonal climate of the public school system and, correspondingly, a need for the supportive atmosphere of the private school; and, second, more positively, the kind of responsiveness to the feeling side of life that is requisite in an educational system that emphasizes the emotional as well as the cognitive needs of the individual child.

While the findings here are remarkably consistent, the extent to which they will be found generalizable to student teacher populations in other cities, in other training institutions, or even in other periods of time is an open question. But, for this time and place, the findings are provocative. Among other reasons, we note considerable overlap between the "childhood characteristics" of the subjects who were judged to be outstanding in their relations with children and those

---

1. The actual agreement/disagreement ratio between student preference and advisor judgment was 3.5 to 1.

who were judged as being most effective and most motivated to teach in public schools and, in parallel, overlap between the childhood self characteristics of subjects who were judged as being only fair or poor in their relations with children and those who both chose and were judged as being most effective in the private school domain. These sets of associations run directly counter to the common assumption that the outstanding teachers are found in the private educational institutions and the poor ones are found, from lack of choice, in inner-city schools. Of course, what happens to the outstanding student teacher after she enters the public school system is another matter--as is her choice to leave or stay. But, at the same time, the dual set of findings here--as we have said--were not based on ignorance either on the part of the student teachers or the advisors --and as such they may reflect trends that supersede mere idealism or hope.

3. Advisor judgments of effectiveness with gifted children and with children who are slow learners. When this criterion was analyzed against MYSELF AS A CHILD, only two scales were found to differentiate between the two groups at or beyond the .05 level of significance (Table 8). The group judged as working best with gifted children viewed their childhood selves as more self-conscious and more dependent than the group judged as working most effectively with slow learners. It should be noted, however, that two such findings out of a possible 60 can be attributed to chance alone.

When the same criterion was examined in relation to the 60 DSCCS items applied to MYSELF NOW, no significant differences were found between the two criterion groups (Table 8).

These latter two sets of findings stand in marked contrast to those reported under Hypothesis 4, where self-evaluations (or subjective feelings) of competence with gifted children and with slow learners were involved. There, on the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD, the scores of the two groups showed significant differences on

six scales, including the hypothetically most pertinent--gifted vs. ordinary; and while MYSELF NOW yielded only one significant difference, it was again on the hypothetically most pertinent scale.

The discrepancy which concerns us here can be explained most parsimoniously by the fact that the subjects who participated in the study were enrolled in the regular (as opposed to the special) teacher education program at the college. This means that the vast majority were assigned to student teaching placements in which the children tended to be "run of the mill" rather than either gifted or characterized by special difficulties in learning. The advisors, therefore, had little opportunity to gain knowledge about their students that would help them in judging their effectiveness on this dimension (and several of the advisors told us this). In contrast, the subjects themselves did not have to depend on their limited experiences as student teachers in assessing themselves on this dimension. Instead they could rely on a lifetime of contacts with children in many contexts, and a resulting general sense of their reactions to gifted children and to slow learners.

4. Subjects' age-level preferences. As shown in Table 8, none of the DSCCS scales applied to MYSELF AS A CHILD was found to differentiate reliably among subject preferences for working with children in each of three age groups; 4 years and below, 5 through 7 years, and 8 years and older. However, it is noteworthy that examination of the ranks of the means on the FAMILY RELATIONS scales revealed that the students preferring to work with the youngest age group, like those who were judged as most effective with this age group (see Hypothesis 2), viewed their parents as being most understanding, as offering them the most support and good advice, as setting the fewest limits and as least often punishing them. Thus, these trends are also consistent with findings based on autobiographies (Rosen, 1972).

As shown in Table 8, the concept MYSELF NOW yielded three scales that differentiated among age-level preferences: bossy vs. unassertive, self-reliant vs. dependent, and dominant vs. subordinate. Examination of the distribution of responses on these three scales indicated that the differences were attributable in large part to the following: the group preferring the oldest children tended to view themselves as more "bossy," and the group preferring the 5 through 7-year-olds, as both more dependent and more subordinate. While each of these three scales differentiated among the groups at or beyond the .05 level of significance, three such differences can be attributed to chance factors.

5. Subjects' self-evaluation of competence to relate to children in general. Given the alternatives of assessing themselves as Very Good, Good, or Fair in their relations with children in general, only four subjects categorized themselves as Fair, ruling out statistical comparisons using this category. Since Very Good carried with it the definition of requiring virtually no further work in this area and Good as still needing some work in this area, we undertook to find out whether differences between these two criterion categorizations of the self would be related to differences in self-concept.

As shown in Table 8, with respect to MYSELF AS A CHILD, no such differences were found.

MYSELF NOW yielded only one "predictor," but this scale, instructing vs. instructed, is of special interest because the same scale applied to MYSELF NOW was one of only three "predictors" of advisor judgments of subject effectiveness with children. As mentioned previously, this is the one scale on the DSCCS that makes direct reference to the teaching role per se; that it should characterize the present self-concept both of those subjects who were judged by their advisors as being able to relate to children most effectively and of those who themselves felt most competent with children, makes the finding difficult to discount as a chance

occurrence. On the contrary, it suggests that these subjects, even as prospective teachers, have a strong sense of their emerging professional identity, which undoubtedly also reflects a relative security about their adult status--a condition that is theoretically essential to the development of relations with children that succeed in promoting children's psychological growth.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

What conclusions, overall, can we draw from the study in terms of substance, theory, method, and implications for research and practice? Each of the subsections to follow encompasses these elements, either explicitly or implicitly, and with varied emphases. The first two subsections are concerned most directly with findings relevant to the practical issues of selection and placement of prospective teachers. The third subsection examines the two basic self-concepts to which the DSCCS scales are applied, with particular reference to their relative stability as predictors under conditions of research and practice. The fourth and final subsection concerns the need for future research with the DSCCS to focus on social-class and ethnic differences. This direction is considered crucial to the development of the DSCCS as an instrument that can be widely applied in the selection and placement of prospective teachers.

1. Findings Bearing on Selection

The findings related to Hypothesis 1 are perhaps the most important because they bear directly on the problem of selecting prospective teachers. The past teacher shortage rendered the selection problem academic, but the present (and projected) oversupply of teachers means that the conditions now exist which would, theoretically, make it possible to select only those candidates who will become effective teachers--if the means of identifying such candidates were available. Our findings deal with the interpersonal aspects of teaching effectiveness; and, as mentioned previously, the teacher's ability to develop good teacher-child relations is widely considered to be the key variable in effecting a positive learning environment, especially where young children are concerned. Furthermore, in our experience if a prospective teacher does not have the basic ability to relate positively to children, she is unlikely to develop such an ability during the course of her training to become a teacher.

In this context, then, the DSCCS findings related to Hypothesis 1 are of special import. The new instrument differentiated between the subjects who were judged as developing outstanding relations with children and those who developed only fair or poor relations with children. More important, the findings are basically the same as those resulting from an earlier study using unstructured autobiographical material from a group of standard research subjects enrolled in six different teacher-training institutions (Rosen, 1968), and from a subsequent study based on autobiographical essays submitted by actual applicants for teacher training at Bank Street College (Rosen, 1974). Moreover, all three sets of findings are consistent with theoretical concepts (as described in the 1968 study and elaborated in the present report) concerned with the role of the childhood self as a resource for the development of adult empathy with children's feelings and needs. Finally, the present subjects were teacher trainees who had already been selected for training on the basis of intensive selection procedures, including in-depth interviews. Had it been possible to include among the present subjects the group of applicants to the training program who had been screened out, the differences on the DSCCS would, it is assumed, have been substantially magnified.[1]

In sum, the findings bearing on Hypothesis 1 in this first study, which developed and applied the DSCCS, provide us with growing confidence in the substantive differences that have been identified among groups of prospective teachers, in the generality of these differences and, finally, in the feasibility of the methodological shift to the DSCCS as an instrument which, with further refinement, should have wide applicability for problems of selecting teachers of children.

2. Findings Bearing on Placement

(a) Age level of the children. One of the central analyses which had been

---

1. Clearly, in future research aimed at refining the instrument, such groups of applicants should be represented in the study populations.

planned for this study was to determine whether prospective teachers who are judged as working best with children at each of three age levels, from preschool through the elementary years, differed in their perceptions of their childhood selves as had their counterparts in an earlier study (Rosen, 1972). While the distribution of subjects across the age-level dimension made it impossible to carry out this analysis as intended, there were trends with respect to the subjects' recollections of their childhood relations within their families that were consistent with earlier findings. Obviously, however, the potential applicability of the DSCCS as an instrument to guide decision-making with respect to the placement of teachers with children of differing ages so as to maximize their effectiveness remains to be determined.

(b) Coping styles of the children. Examination of the subjects' effectiveness with children who display differing coping styles, i.e., outgoing, assertive, and active vs. shy, withdrawn, and passive, revealed that the DSCCS has the potential for making differentiations on this dimension which could be used as gross indicators for teacher placement in work with groups of children or with individual children where these differences in coping style are particularly relevant. As predicted, the subjects' childhood selves tended to parallel the coping styles of children with whom they were judged to be most effective and with them they themselves felt most competent.

This basic congruence of findings with respect to observer judgment and subjective feelings on the part of the present subjects is important for several reasons. First, the child-care worker study (Rosen, 1963), which gave rise to the present hypotheses dealing with this dimension, dealt only with the workers' subjective feelings of competence, not with objective evaluations of that competence. It was stated at that time, however, that there was reason to believe that these subjective evaluations of competence are associated with actual competence,

first, because if the worker felt deficient or uncomfortable in coping with the extremes of aggressiveness or withdrawal in children, it was likely that actual difficulties existed in his or her relationship with children who presented such behavior. Moreover, since the worker was evaluating his relative, and not his absolute competence in relation to his work with each of two types of children, there was reason to assume that he could speak with considerable freedom and that the feelings of competence that he expressed were an important element in the effectiveness of his work. The present findings tend to support this assumption.

Second, the fact that both objective and subjective evaluations of effectiveness vis-a-vis these coping styles in children parallel the subjects' perceptions of their own childhood tendencies in one or the other of these directions is consistent with a major theoretical concept guiding this work--that the childhood self serves as a basic resource for empathy with children and, further, that such empathy is essential to the development of effective relations with children.

In stating this, it is recognized that empathy with the feelings and needs of the child must be tempered with objectivity and perspective on the part of the adult. In the absence of the latter qualities, overidentification with the child is a likely consequence; and where this occurs. the adult tends to engage in behavior that is basically directed toward his own unmet needs rather than toward the needs of the child. It is important, therefore, to develop the means by which to assess tendencies toward overidentification in the prospective teacher so that we can differentiate the potential for appropriate forms and degrees of empathy with children from those which may have inappropriate and destructive consequences. Until this is accomplished, however, we can be guided by the mounting evidence that, relatively speaking, the prospective teacher is more likely to be effective with children whose coping styles more closely resemble her own than with children whose coping styles are very different from or diametrically opposed to her own.

As a final note here, it is relevant to cite Bettelheim's (1974) reference to this investigator's work in this area: "...while Rosen's findings are correct, the identifications she describes represent an immature object choice on the part of adults, narcissistically pleasing but not suitable for a constructive relation; because instead of promoting growth, it retards or prevents it" (p. 321). Although one cannot quibble with this interpretation as applied to the child-care worker study (Rosen, 1963), since no outside judgments of effectiveness were involved, in applying it to the study of student teachers and children of varying ages (Rosen, 1972), Bettelheim's conclusions are faulty. They are based on factual error, since in the latter study the criteria were advisor judgments of effectiveness, not student teacher preferences. The point, however, is that Bettelheim's experience is in fact with child-care workers engaged in intensive therapeutic relationships with institutionalized, severely disturbed children, whose task it is to help such children move from their extremely distorted (often autistic) perceptions of the world toward some semblance of order and relatedness to people. This process typically takes place over a period of years, and during this time the workers themselves must engage in what is tantamount to a psychoanalytically-oriented therapeutic procedure. Clearly, identification on their part with the child's illness is likely to retard or prevent growth in the child, and it is crucial for such workers to gain insight into themselves and grow in order to work effectively with the children.

But teacher-child relations are of a quite different order. Moreover, Bettelheim's ideal of a teacher who does not "identify" with any child, and who can (presumably) relate to all children with equal effectiveness is likely to remain an ideal indeed. The reality is that teachers, like most other adults, relate better to children who manifest certain characteristics than they do to children who display other characteristics. And in the absence of a vehicle in the

schools for promoting psychological growth in teachers such that they approach Bettelheim's ideal, it behooves researchers to find ways of helping educators to select and place teachers so as to utilize most effectively the human potentials that already exist in reality.

(c) Intellectual Characteristics of the Children. Whereas on the coping dimension described above both the advisor judgments of subject effectiveness and the subjects' self-evaluations yielded generally parallel findings on the intellectual dimension the findings produced by the judgments of the advisors can be attributed to chance. Indeed, only two statistically significant differences were found between the childhood self-concepts of subjects whom the advisors judged as being most effective with intellectually gifted children and those judged as best with slow learners; and these differences (i.e., the former group viewed themselves as more self-conscious and as more dependent) make no apparent sense on theoretical grounds. Moreover, as stated previously, the advisors did not really appear to have sufficient relevant observational data to make adequate judgments on this dimension.

We are left, therefore, with the subjects' evaluations of their own competence on this dimension. And here, both with respect to the childhood self and to the adult self, the theoretically most relevant scale--gifted vs. ordinary--reliably differentiated between the groups and did so in the predicted direction. Again, while we cannot as yet know for certain, we can speculate that these self-evaluations of relative competence bear a substantial relationship to the subjects' actual competence, for the same reasons that were given at the time of the child-care worker study. Moreover, with specific reference to the intellectual dimension, it makes sense that a prospective teacher who views herself as "ordinary" might, on the one hand, question her ability to provide sufficient challenge to gifted children or, on the other hand, feel frankly threatened by them. Similarly,

the prospective teacher who feels that she is gifted might herself require the intellectual challenge of bright children and at the same time become impatient with the pace and repetition involved in working with children who are slow to learn. Thus, until further research demonstrates otherwise, the findings regarding the childhood self, as these relate to self-evaluations of relative competence with gifted children vs. slow learners may be assumed to provide gross indicators of actual competence vis-a-vis these intellectual characteristics in children.

(d) School settings. While most of the analyses carried out in this study were designed either to test hypotheses that had been generated by earlier findings and theoretical concepts, or were related to such findings and concepts, the analyses concerned with the subjects' preferences to teach in public vs. private school settings and with their advisors' judgments of their effectiveness in these settings were simply exploratory. It was therefore of special interest that the concept of the childhood self yielded more predictors of school setting than of any other criteria that were examined; and, further, that there was considerable overlap between the childhood self predictors of the advisors' judgments and of the subjects' own preferences. This, and the additional fact that there is internal consistency to the predictors, make a strong case for the validity of the findings as they apply to the study sample. But the generality of the findings clearly needs to be determined.

Moreover, the self-concepts of the student teachers who preferred--and were judged to be potentially most effective in--inner-city public schools paralleled in important ways the self-concepts of those subjects who were judged to be outstanding in their teacher-child relations; and those who preferred and were deemed most appropriate for private or independent schools had concepts of themselves that were similar to those of the subjects who were judged as being only fair or poor in their relations with children. As a finding that runs counter to general

expectations--and one that has broad implications at this time of crisis in the inner-city public schools--this issue warrants intensive research.

3. MYSELF AS A CHILD and MYSELF NOW as Predictors

A hypothesis of the study (in fact, a basic assumption) was that the perceived childhood self is a better predictor of adult-child relations than is the perceived adult self. By and large, the findings supported this hypothesis. Yet there were instances where MYSELF NOW yielded a single predictor that was directly on target and therfore the finding could not be readily dismissed. For example, those subjects who were judged by their advisors as being most effective with outgoing children were found to differ from their counterparts who were judged as being most effective with shy, withdrawn children on only one DSCCS dimension applied to MYSELF NOW: outgoing vs. shy. Similarly, with respect to another single dimension, subjects who themselves felt most competent with gifted children significantly more often viewed themselves as gifted than did those who felt more effective with children who are slow learners or who have specific learning difficulties.

Aside from these indications that the current self-concept has some relevance for predicting adult-child relations along specified dimensions, there were further suggestions that this concept can yield indicators of an emerging professional identity which may also be integral to the development of positive teacher-child relations, balancing empathy with children with objectivity and adult perspective. Specifically, those subjects who were judged to be outstanding in their overall relations with children significantly more often than those who were judged to be only fair or poor in these relations viewed their current selves as instructing rather than instructed; and the same difference on the DSCCS was found between subjects who themselves felt they needed no further work on their relations with children and those who did feel such a need.

While citing the relevance of MYSELF NOW as a predictor of certain aspects of adult-child relations in the current study, it is important to take note of some further observations concerning this concept and its potential usefulness--and limitation--as a practical tool for assessing such relations in prospective candidates for teacher training. On virtually every scale to which a positive and a negative value can readily be assigned, the subjects rated themselves more positively on MYSELF NOW than they did on MYSELF AS A CHILD (and there was much greater variability on the scales applied to the latter concept). The implication is that MYSELF NOW is (not surprisingly) much more susceptible to the influence of a social desirability set than is MYSELF AS A CHILD. For while the present self is indeed the "Me" for which the subject feels responsible, the childhood self is either "Not Me" or "No Longer Me" or, at the least, "Only Partly Me." That social desirability factors presumably operated with respect to MYSELF NOW in the present study, where the subjects had nothing at stake in terms of their future careers, where group trends, rather than individuals were emphasized as the focus of the research, and where the instruments were identified by code numbers rather than by names, it must be assumed that a social desirability set would operate more powerfully were the DSCCS to be used as a teacher-training selection procedure.

For the reasons cited, however, the concept MYSELF AS A CHILD is not as likely to lose its predictive value when applied in the context of a selection process. And this assumption is further supported by an earlier study (Rosen, 1974). In that study, subjects who were judged as relating poorly to children during student teaching placements described their childhood selves negatively in autobiographies which they wrote as part of their application for training significantly more often than their counterparts who were judged as outstanding in their relations with children. But no corresponding differences between the groups were evident in their autobiographical references to their current selves. Clearly, MYSELF NOW

requires further investigation as a concept to be used as a predictor in real-life decision-making contexts.

Finally, further research should include a comparative study of the DSCCS scales applied to MYSELF NOW and to MYSELF AS A CHILD for each individual. This additional direction was suggested by some of our exploratory work with the instrument. Specifically, we have found that in those individual cases where MYSELF NOW was rated more negatively than MYSELF AS A CHILD, the subjects were invariably reported by their advisors to be experiencing emotional difficulties serious enough to warrant psychiatric intervention. These preliminary explorations suggest that the usefulness of the DSCCS may be found to extend beyond the terrain of the teacher-educator into the broader diagnostic field of the mental health professional.

4. The Importance of Social Class Factors

The findings of the present study have indicated that the DSCCS holds promise as an instrument to be used in selecting, guiding and placing prospective teachers. This study, however, like those from which it evolved, has been based primarily on middle-class subjects. The same limitation holds for the theoretical concepts that have both guided this work and developed from it. Thus, the applicability of the findings--and of the DSCCS itself--across social-class groups remains to be determined.

The need to broaden the base of this program of studies to incorporate social-class variation is underlined by the following considerations. First, teaching children is one of the few professions that extends its reach to women from all social-class backgrounds. Although this is a commonplace observation--indeed, perhaps because of it--we know little about the ramifications of the teacher's social-class origin for a key variable--the teacher's personality. Educators and social psychologists have acknowledged that the social-class origin of the teacher has a

powerful influence on the teacher's personality (Havighurst and Neugarten, 1967; Havighurst and Levine, 1971). But the dimensions of teacher personality that are in fact influenced by the social-class origin of the teacher have not been identified. Nor do we know whether the personality dimensions that are influenced by social-class origin are those most relevant for predicting important variations in the attitudes that teachers develop toward children.

Second, as has been seen in this report, predictors of teachers' attitudes toward, and relations with, children (and also of their career goals and patterns) have been found to lie in prospective teachers' characterizations of their childhood selves and of their early intrafamilial relations. And these characteristics, in turn, have been found to be theoretically consistent with their concepts of themselves as adults. Based on sociological studies of social-class differences in family style and child-rearing practices, there is reason to assume that prospective teachers from different social-class origins have experienced different types of relations within their families in the course of growing up, for example, along classic dimensions such as parental permissiveness vs. parental authoritarianism (Davis and Havighurst, 1946; Sears, Maccoby, and Levin, 1957). This assumption, then, raises new questions:

(1) Do prospective teachers' recollections of their relations within their families in fact differ as a function of their social-class background?

(2) If such recalled differences exist, are they systematically correlated with differences in the subjects' characterizations of the self as a child? with those of the self at the present time?

(3) Assuming variations within each social-class group, and overlap across groups, do patterns of recollections which have had predictive value for middle-class subjects cut across social-class origins as predictors of present self-concept? of attitudes toward children? of career goals, that is, of planning to make

a life's work of classroom teaching vs. assuming a superordinate role in relation to other adults, as in administration, college teaching, supervision?

Furthermore, in view of the fact that for women from working-class origins becoming a teacher represents a shift in social status to that of the middle class (Colombotos, 1962), do groups of such teachers view themselves and children differently from middle-class teachers for whom entry into the teaching profession carries no such status implications? Moreover, compared with those whose social status has remained unchanged, do those who have achieved upward mobility reflect a greater sense of personal change over time as exemplified in the characterizations of the childhood self and the self at present?

Clearly a major direction for future research aimed at refining the DSCCS and extending the range of its potential usefulness lies in the assessment of the effects of social-class variation.

The long-range goal of the investigator's research on adult personality and adult-child relations is to contribute knowledge and method which can be widely applied in the selection, placement, and training of adults who elect to work with children in education and mental health settings. The development of the DSCCS may well constitute a critical step toward this end.

Table 1

Means and Ranks of Subjects' DSCCS Ratings of MYSELF AS A CHILD According to Advisor Judgments of Subjects' Overall Relations with Children (Outstanding, Good, Fair/Poor)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings				Ranks[b]		
		Total	O	G	F/P			
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81	N=26	N=41	N=14	O	G	F/P
Capable	Helpless	4.90	5.15	4.76	4.86	1	3	2
Rational	Irrational	4.81	4.85	4.95	4.36	2	1	3
Brave	Fearful	3.68	3.81	3.54	3.85	2	3	1
Defies authority	Respects auth.*	2.50	1.81	2.73	3.14	3	2	1
Popular	Left out	4.55	4.32	4.78	3.71	2	1	3
Bossy	Unassertive	3.72	3.46	3.80	3.93	3	2	1
Adequate	Inadequate	4.85	5.15	4.80	4.38	1	2	3
Playful	Serious	3.68	3.85	3.76	3.14	1	2	3
Rebellious	Conforming	2.96	3.00	2.88	3.14	2	3	1
Harmonious	Conflicted	3.65	3.88	3.73	3.00	1	2	3
Self-confident	Unsure	3.70	3.85	3.83	3.07	1	2	3
Spontaneous	Reserved	3.72	3.62	3.74	3.86	3	2	1
Achievement-oriented	Easy going	4.57	4.85	4.41	4.50	1	3	2
Competitive	Noncompet.*	4.30	4.54	4.37	3.64	1	2	3
Prefers children	Prefers adults	3.98	4.00	4.20	3.29	2	1	3
Boisterous	Quiet	3.16	2.80	3.37	3.21	3	1	2
Loved	Unloved*	4.91	5.36	4.93	4.07	1	2	3
Leader	Follower	4.16	4.08	4.33	3.86	2	1	3
Friendly	Aloof	4.78	4.88	4.80	4.50	1	2	3
Abstract	Concrete	3.08	2.76	3.22	3.21	3	1	2
Happy-go-lucky	Sober	3.59	3.35	3.78	3.50	3	1	2
Self-reliant	Dependent	4.22	4.46	3.98	4.50	2	3	1
Controlled	Impulsive	3.85	4.35	3.73	3.29	1	2	3
Instructing	Instructed*	3.99	3.58	4.07	4.43	3	2	1
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.	2.56	2.42	2.73	2.36	2	1	3
Optimistic	Pessimistic	4.50	4.62	4.58	4.07	1	2	3
Coping	Avoiding	4.51	4.69	4.56	4.00	1	2	3
Old for age	Young for age	4.60	4.58	4.60	4.64	3	2	1
Stormy	Placid	3.49	3.23	3.56	3.79	3	2	1
Secure	Insecure	3.85	4.24	3.85	3.14	1	2	3
Sense of humor	Humorless	4.90	4.96	5.00	4.50	2	1	3
Belonging	Lonely	3.90	3.96	4.15	3.07	2	1	3
Efficient	Inefficient	4.75	4.88	4.78	4.43	1	2	3

Table 1 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings				Ranks[b]		
		Total	O	G	F/P			
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81	N=26	N=41	N=14	O	G	F/P
Flexible	Inflexible	4.30	4.40	4.28	4.21	1	2	3
Fast	Slow	4.68	4.36	4.85	4.79	3	1	2
Resourceful	Needy	4.91	5.00	4.98	4.57	1	2	3
Imaginative	Practical	3.58	3.54	3.66	3.43	2	1	3
Outgoing	Shy	3.72	3.58	3.73	3.93	3	2	1
Trusting	Wary	4.41	4.62	4.44	3.93	1	2	3
Gifted	Ordinary	4.36	4.38	4.39	4.21	2	1	3
Influential	Influenced	4.00	3.69	4.18	4.07	3	1	2
Responsible	Carefree*	4.30	4.77	4.12	3.92	1	2	3
Bright	Dull	5.10	5.15	5.20	4.71	2	1	3
Patient	Impatient	3.53	4.04	3.39	3.00	1	2	3
Warm	Cool	4.84	5.12	4.83	4.36	1	2	3
Relaxed	Tense	3.35	3.15	3.61	2.93	2	1	3
Logical	Intuitive	3.20	2.92	3.25	3.57	3	2	1
Aggressive	Timid	3.60	3.31	3.68	3.93	3	2	1
Extroverted	Introverted	3.68	3.65	3.83	3.29	2	1	3
Cheerful	Solemn	4.35	4.42	4.49	3.79	2	1	3
Dominant	Subordinate	4.03	3.88	4.15	3.93	3	1	2
Cool	Emotional	2.51	2.42	2.51	2.64	3	2	1
Tough	Oversensitive	2.39	2.40	2.34	2.50	2	3	1
Active	Passive	4.31	4.38	4.37	4.00	1	2	3
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease*	3.98	4.15	4.07	3.36	1	2	3
Close	Distant	4.29	4.54	4.27	3.93	1	2	3
Happy	Sad	4.52	4.33	4.78	4.07	2	1	3
Fighter	Peacemaker	2.79	2.58	2.80	3.14	3	2	1
Independent	Dependent	4.22	4.64	3.78	4.71	2	3	1
Giving	Receiving	4.29	4.46	4.37	3.79	1	2	3

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 6; a rank of 3 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 1.

*$p < .05$ (two-tailed test) based on χ^2 applied to Outstanding vs. Fair/Poor groups.

Table 2

Means and Ranks of Subjects' Ratings on FAMILY RELATIONS Scales According to Advisor Judgments of Subjects' Overall Relations with Children (Outstanding, Good, Fair/Poor)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings				Ranks[b]		
		Total	O	G	F/P			
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81	N=26	N=41	N=14	O	G	F/P
AS A CHILD, I FELT MY PARENTS almost always understood me	almost never understood me	3.81	3.77	4.08	3.14	2	1	3
THROUGHOUT MY LIFE, I HAVE SEEN MY PARENTS AS almost always giving me support and good advice	almost never giving me support and good advice	4.38	4.38	4.51	4.00	2	1	3
WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY PARENTS set almost no limits on my behavior	set many limits on my behavior	2.93	3.12	2.78	3.00	1	3	2
IN THE COURSE OF GROWING UP I hardly rebelled at all against my parents	I rebelled actively against my parents	3.57	3.92	3.27	3.86	1	3	2
I WOULD DESCRIBE MY FAMILY AS warm, close-knit	distant, loosely-knit	4.40	4.62	4.44	3.86	1	2	3
WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY PARENTS almost never punished me	often punished me	4.07	4.38	4.17	3.21	1	2	3
WHEN I THINK ABOUT IT, MY BASIC VALUES NOW ARE those I learned from my parents as a child	quite different from those of my parents	3.84	4.12	3.75	3.57	1	2	3
AS A CHILD, I FELT CLOSEST TO my mother (or mother surrogate)	my father (or father surrogate)	4.46	4.28	4.59	4.43	3	1	2

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 6; a rank of 3 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 1.

Table 3

Means and Ranks of Subjects' Ratings of MYSELF NOW According to Advisor Judgments of Subjects' Overall Relations with Children (Outstanding, Good, Fair/Poor)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings				Ranks[b]		
		Total	O	G	F/P			
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81	N=26	N=41	N=14	O	G	F/P
Capable	Helpless	5.30	5.54	5.24	5.00	1	2	3
Rational	Irrational	4.94	5.19	4.85	4.71	1	2	3
Brave	Fearful	4.22	4.27	4.22	4.14	1	2	3
Defies authority	Respects auth.	3.11	2.69	3.46	2.93	3	1	2
Popular	Left out	4.80	5.04	4.73	4.57	1	2	3
Bossy	Unassertive	3.75	3.65	3.85	3.64	2	1	3
Adequate	Inadequate	5.06	5.24	5.08	4.71	1	2	3
Playful	Serious	3.65	3.68	3.71	3.43	2	1	3
Rebellious	Conforming	3.83	3.77	3.95	3.57	2	1	3
Harmonious	Conflicted	3.74	4.08	3.46	3.93	1	3	2
Self-confident	Unsure	4.23	4.54	4.12	4.00	1	2	3
Spontaneous	Reserved	4.00	3.88	4.05	4.07	3	2	1
Achievement-oriented	Easy going	3.99	4.19	3.88	3.93	1	3	2
Competitive	Noncompet.	3.59	3.48	3.83	3.08	2	1	3
Prefers children	Prefers adults	3.15	3.17	3.16	3.07	1	2	3
Boisterous	Quiet	3.03	3.12	3.00	2.92	1	2	3
Loved	Unloved	5.16	5.31	5.10	5.07	1	2	3
Leader	Follower	4.34	4.31	4.50	3.93	2	1	3
Friendly	Aloof	5.10	5.35	5.02	4.86	1	2	3
Abstract	Concrete	3.20	3.00	3.37	3.07	3	1	2
Happy-go-lucky	Sober	3.31	3.15	3.51	3.00	2	1	3
Self-reliant	Dependent	4.66	4.92	4.59	4.43	1	2	3
Controlled	Impulsive	3.65	4.15	3.37	3.57	1	3	2
Instructing	Instructed*	4.31	4.36	4.44	3.86	2	1	3
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.	3.12	3.35	3.07	2.86	1	2	3
Optimistic	Pessimistic	4.51	4.42	4.44	4.86	3	2	1
Coping	Avoiding	4.86	5.00	4.79	4.79	1	2	2
Old for age	Young for age	3.40	3.60	3.38	3.07	1	2	3
Stormy	Placid*	3.47	3.31	3.39	4.00	3	2	1
Secure	Insecure	4.15	4.56	3.93	4.07	1	3	2
Sense of humor	Humorless	5.19	5.15	5.15	5.36	2	2	1
Belonging	Lonely	4.20	4.23	4.23	4.07	1	1	3
Efficient	Inefficient	4.68	4.81	4.72	4.36	1	2	3

Table 3 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings				Ranks[b]		
		Total	O	G	F/P			
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81	N=26	N=41	N=14	O	G	F/P
Flexible	Inflexible	4.98	5.08	5.02	4.64	1	2	3
Fast	Slow*	4.38	3.96	4.55	4.64	3	2	1
Resourceful	Needy	4.99	5.27	4.95	4.57	1	2	3
Imaginative	Practical	3.41	3.19	3.63	3.21	3	1	2
Outgoing	Shy	4.38	4.38	4.37	4.43	2	3	1
Trusting	Wary	4.26	4.40	4.20	4.21	1	3	2
Gifted	Ordinary	4.26	4.42	4.24	4.00	1	2	3
Influential	Influenced	4.25	4.24	4.34	4.00	2	1	3
Responsible	Carefree	4.83	5.16	4.68	4.64	1	2	3
Bright	Dull	5.05	5.23	5.05	4.71	1	2	3
Patient	Impatient	4.14	4.31	4.22	3.57	1	2	3
Warm	Cool	5.00	5.04	5.00	4.93	1	2	3
Relaxed	Tense	3.62	3.54	3.68	3.57	3	1	2
Logical	Intuitive	3.21	3.20	3.10	3.57	2	3	1
Aggressive	Timid	4.04	3.65	4.24	4.14	3	1	2
Extroverted	Introverted	3.85	3.73	3.85	4.07	3	2	1
Cheerful	Solemn	4.61	4.46	4.78	4.43	2	1	3
Dominant	Subordinate	4.15	4.04	4.29	3.93	2	1	3
Cool	Emotional	2.47	2.38	2.49	2.57	3	2	1
Tough	Oversensitive	2.69	2.92	2.59	2.57	1	2	3
Active	Passive	4.50	4.35	4.63	4.43	3	1	2
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	4.29	4.36	4.35	4.00	1	2	3
Close	Distant	4.44	4.74	4.41	4.00	1	2	3
Happy	Sad	4.65	4.35	4.85	4.67	3	1	2
Fighter	Peacemaker	2.33	2.00	2.38	2.79	3	2	1
Independent	Dependent	4.80	5.00	4.71	4.71	1	2	2
Giving	Receiving	4.70	4.92	4.51	4.86	1	3	2

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 6; a rank of 3 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closest to scale point 1.

*$p < .05$ (two-tailed test) based on χ^2 applied to Outstanding vs. Fair/Poor groups.

Table 4

Means and Ranks of Subjects' Ratings of MYSELF AS A CHILD According to Advisor Judgments of Subjects' Effectiveness with Outgoing, Assertive, Active Children vs. Shy, Withdrawn, Passive Children

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[b]	
			Best With		Best With	
6,5,4	3,2,1	Total N=81	Outgoing N=31	Shy N=50	Outgoing	Shy
Capable	Helpless	4.90	4.71	5.02	2	1
Rational	Irrational	4.81	4.90	4.76	1	2
Brave	Fearful*	3.68	3.32	3.90	2	1
Defies authority	Respects auth.	2.50	2.58	2.45	1	2
Popular	Left out	4.55	4.61	4.51	1	2
Bossy	Unassertive	3.72	4.10	3.48	1	2
Adequate	Inadequate	4.85	4.71	4.94	2	1
Playful	Serious	3.68	3.84	3.58	1	2
Rebellious	Conforming	2.96	2.90	3.00	2	1
Harmonious	Conflicted	3.65	3.45	3.76	2	1
Self-confident	Unsure	3.70	3.97	3.54	1	2
Spontaneous	Reserved*	3.72	4.13	3.47	1	2
Achievement-oriented	Easy going	4.57	4.61	4.54	1	2
Competitive	Noncompet.	4.30	4.55	4.14	1	2
Prefers children	Prefers adults	3.98	4.06	3.92	1	2
Boisterous	Quiet	3.16	3.52	2.94	1	2
Loved	Unloved	4.91	4.90	4.92	2	1
Leader	Follower	4.16	4.40	4.02	1	2
Friendly	Aloof	4.78	5.03	4.62	1	2
Abstract	Concrete	3.08	3.13	3.04	1	2
Happy-go-lucky	Sober	3.59	3.97	3.36	1	2
Self-reliant	Dependent	4.22	4.00	4.35	2	1
Controlled	Impulsive	3.85	3.48	4.08	2	1
Instructing	Instructed	3.99	3.93	4.02	2	1
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.	2.56	2.74	2.45	1	2
Optimistic	Pessimistic	4.50	4.60	4.44	1	2
Coping	Avoiding	4.51	4.52	4.50	1	2
Old for age	Young for age	4.60	4.47	4.68	2	1
Stormy	Placid	3.49	3.42	3.54	2	1
Secure	Insecure	3.85	4.10	3.69	1	2
Sense of humor	Humorless	4.90	4.97	4.86	1	2
Belonging	Lonely	3.90	3.97	3.86	1	2
Efficient	Inefficient	4.75	4.77	4.73	1	2

Table 4 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[b]	
			Best With		Best With	
6,5,4	3,2,1	Total N=81	Outgoing N=31	Shy N=50	Outgoing	Shy
Flexible	Inflexible	4.30	4.50	4.18	1	2
Fast	Slow	4.68	4.75	4.64	1	2
Resourceful	Needy	4.91	4.80	4.98	2	1
Imaginative	Practical	3.58	3.23	3.80	2	1
Outgoing	Shy	3.72	4.00	3.54	1	2
Trusting	Wary	4.41	4.61	4.28	1	2
Gifted	Ordinary	4.36	4.35	4.36	2	1
Influential	Influenced	4.00	3.97	4.02	2	1
Responsible	Carefree*	4.30	3.71	4.67	2	1
Bright	Dull	5.10	5.03	5.14	2	1
Patient	Impatient*	3.53	2.97	3.88	2	1
Warm	Cool	4.84	4.97	4.76	1	2
Relaxed	Tense	3.35	3.16	3.46	2	1
Logical	Intuitive	3.20	3.03	3.31	2	1
Aggressive	Timid	3.60	3.87	3.44	1	2
Extroverted	Introverted	3.68	3.87	3.55	1	2
Cheerful	Solemn	4.35	4.58	4.20	1	2
Dominant	Subordinate	4.03	4.13	3.96	1	2
Cool	Emotional	2.51	2.52	2.50	1	2
Tough	Oversensitive	2.39	2.50	2.32	1	2
Active	Passive	4.31	4.29	4.32	2	1
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	3.98	3.87	4.04	2	1
Close	Distant	4.29	4.33	4.27	1	2
Happy	Sad	4.52	4.43	4.57	2	1
Fighter	Peacemaker	2.79	2.80	2.78	1	2
Independent	Dependent	4.22	3.93	4.39	2	1
Giving	Receiving*	4.29	3.90	4.53	2	1

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 6; a rank of 2 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 1.

*$p < .05$ based on χ^2 (two-tailed test).

Table 5

Means and Ranks of Subjects' Ratings of MYSELF AS A CHILD According to Subjects' Self-Evaluations of Competence with Outgoing, Assertive, Active Children vs. Shy, Withdrawn, Passive Children

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[c]	
			Best With		Best With	
		Total	Outgoing	Shy		
6,5,4	3,2,1	N=81[b]	N=48	N=27	Outgoing	Shy
Capable	Helpless	4.90	4.98	4.63	1	2
Rational	Irrational	4.81	4.92	4.70	1	2
Brave	Fearful*	3.68	3.75	3.42	1	2
Defies authority	Respects auth.	2.50	2.68	2.26	1	2
Popular	Left out	4.55	4.51	4.52	2	1
Bossy	Unassertive*	3.72	3.81	3.44	1	2
Adequate	Inadequate	4.85	4.83	4.73	1	2
Playful	Serious	3.68	3.79	3.41	1	2
Rebellious	Conforming	2.96	3.06	2.78	1	2
Harmonious	Conflicted	3.65	3.85	3.30	1	2
Self-confident	Unsure	3.70	3.81	3.48	1	2
Spontaneous	Reserved	3.72	3.70	3.69	1	2
Achievement-oriented	Easy going	4.57	4.73	4.19	1	2
Competitive	Noncompet.	4.30	4.38	3.96	1	2
Prefers children	Prefers adults	3.98	3.85	4.30	2	1
Boisterous	Quiet	3.16	3.34	2.78	1	2
Loved	Unloved	4.91	4.81	5.04	2	1
Leader	Follower	4.16	4.26	3.88	1	2
Friendly	Aloof	4.78	4.81	4.63	1	2
Abstract	Concrete	3.08	2.98	3.35	2	1
Happy-go-lucky	Sober	3.59	3.77	3.27	1	2
Self-reliant	Dependent*	4.22	4.61	3.48	1	2
Controlled	Impulsive	3.85	3.73	4.00	2	1
Instructing	Instructed	3.99	4.15	3.70	1	2
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.	2.56	2.74	2.33	1	2
Optimistic	Pessimistic	4.50	4.69	4.15	1	2
Coping	Avoiding*	4.51	4.69	4.15	1	2
Old for age	Young for age	4.60	4.63	4.46	1	2
Stormy	Placid	3.76	3.52	3.56	2	1
Secure	Insecure	3.85	4.15	3.27	1	2
Sense of humor	Humorless	4.90	4.96	4.67	1	2
Belonging	Lonely	3.90	3.92	3.74	1	2
Efficient	Inefficient	4.75	4.77	4.76	1	2

Table 5 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[c]	
			Best With		Best With	
6,5,4	3,2,1	Total N=81[b]	Outgoing N=48	Shy N=27	Outgoing	Shy
Flexible	Inflexible	4.30	4.40	4.08	1	2
Fast	Slow	4.68	4.90	4.21	1	2
Resourceful	Needy	4.91	4.90	4.81	1	2
Imaginative	Practical	3.58	3.33	3.74	2	1
Outgoing	Shy	3.72	3.94	3.30	1	2
Trusting	Wary	4.41	4.42	4.33	1	2
Gifted	Ordinary	4.36	4.38	4.30	1	2
Influential	Influenced	4.00	3.96	3.85	1	2
Responsible	Carefree	4.30	4.38	4.04	1	2
Bright	Dull	5.10	5.10	5.07	1	2
Patient	Impatient	3.53	3.54	3.56	2	1
Warm	Cool	4.84	5.06	4.42	1	2
Relaxed	Tense	3.35	3.25	3.44	2	1
Logical	Intuitive	3.20	3.23	3.23	1	1
Aggressive	Timid	3.50	3.73	3.30	1	2
Extroverted	Introverted*	3.68	3.94	3.19	1	2
Cheerful	Solemn	4.35	4.48	4.04	1	2
Dominant	Subordinate	4.03	4.15	3.70	1	2
Cool	Emotional	2.51	2.50	2.63	2	1
Tough	Oversensitive	2.39	2.58	1.96	1	2
Active	Passive	4.31	4.46	3.85	1	2
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	3.98	4.08	3.81	1	2
Close	Distant	4.29	4.28	4.33	2	1
Happy	Sad	4.52	4.54	4.44	1	2
Fighter	Peacemaker	2.79	2.67	2.92	2	1
Independent	Dependent	4.22	4.37	3.81	1	2
Giving	Receiving	4.29	4.39	4.15	1	2

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]The N of the total group is larger than the combined Ns of the two criterion groups because of attrition in the sample at the criterion phase when the self-evaluations of competence were obtained.

[c]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 6; a rank of 2 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 1.

*$p < .05$ based on χ^2 (two-tailed test).

Table 6

Means and Ranks of Subjects' Ratings of MYSELF AS A CHILD According to Subjects' Self-Evaluations of Competence with Intellectually Gifted Children vs. Children Who Are Slow Learners or Have Specific Learning Difficulties

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[c]	
			Best With		Best With	
6,5,4	3,2,1	Total N=81[b]	Gifted N=44	Slow N=32	Gifted	Slow
Capable	Helpless	4.90	4.77	4.97	2	1
Rational	Irrational	4.81	5.05	4.56	1	2
Brave	Fearful	3.68	3.57	3.74	2	1
Defies authority	Respects auth.	2.50	2.42	2.72	2	1
Popular	Left out	4.55	4.55	4.52	1	2
Bossy	Unassertive	3.72	3.59	3.84	2	1
Adequate	Inadequate	4.85	4.77	4.84	2	1
Playful	Serious	3.68	3.48	3.94	2	1
Rebellious	Conforming	2.96	2.64	3.44	2	1
Harmonious	Conflicted	3.65	3.51	3.81	2	1
Self-confident	Unsure*	3.70	3.43	4.09	2	1
Spontaneous	Reserved	3.72	3.64	3.81	2	1
Achievement-oriented	Easy going	4.57	4.68	4.34	1	2
Competitive	Noncompet.*	4.30	4.55	3.81	1	2
Prefers children	Prefers adults	3.98	4.36	3.56	1	2
Boisterous	Quiet	3.16	2.98	3.42	2	1
Loved	Unloved	4.91	4.77	5.06	2	1
Leader	Follower	4.16	4.12	4.19	2	1
Friendly	Aloof	4.78	4.75	4.75	1	1
Abstract	Concrete	3.08	3.23	2.90	1	2
Happy-go-lucky	Sober*	3.59	3.30	3.94	2	1
Self-reliant	Dependent	4.22	4.05	4.43	2	1
Controlled	Impulsive	3.85	3.80	3.88	2	1
Instructing	Instructed	3.99	3.93	4.10	2	1
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.	2.56	2.44	2.81	2	1
Optimistic	Pessimistic	4.50	4.58	4.41	1	2
Coping	Avoiding	4.51	4.61	4.34	1	2
Old for age	Young for age	4.60	4.53	4.59	2	1
Stormy	Placid	3.49	3.55	3.53	1	2
Secure	Insecure	3.85	3.70	4.03	2	1
Sense of humor	Humorless	4.90	4.98	4.69	1	2
Belonging	Lonely	3.90	3.59	4.28	2	1
Efficient	Inefficient	4.75	4.71	4.81	2	1

Table 6 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items[a]		Mean Ratings			Ranks[c]	
			Best With		Best With	
6,5,4	3,2,1	Total N=81[b]	Gifted N=44	Slow N=32	Gifted	Slow
Flexible	Inflexible	4.30	4.19	4.45	2	1
Fast	Slow	4.68	4.65	4.70	2	1
Resourceful	Needy	4.91	4.86	4.88	2	1
Imaginative	Practical	3.58	3.48	3.53	2	1
Outgoing	Shy	3.72	3.64	3.84	2	1
Trusting	Wary	4.41	4.32	4.50	2	1
Gifted	Ordinary*	4.36	4.61	4.00	1	2
Influential	Influenced	4.00	3.88	4.03	2	1
Responsible	Carefree	4.30	4.23	4.31	2	1
Bright	Dull	5.10	5.25	4.88	1	2
Patient	Impatient	3.53	3.61	3.47	1	2
Warm	Cool	4.84	4.81	4.88	2	1
Relaxed	Tense	3.35	3.14	3.53	2	1
Logical	Intuitive	3.20	3.23	3.19	1	2
Aggressive	Timid	3.60	3.57	3.63	2	1
Extroverted	Introverted	3.68	3.49	3.94	2	1
Cheerful	Solemn	4.35	4.23	4.47	2	1
Dominant	Subordinate	4.03	3.80	4.29	2	1
Cool	Emotional	2.51	2.68	2.34	1	2
Tough	Oversensitive	2.39	2.34	2.42	2	1
Active	Passive	4.31	4.25	4.25	1	1
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	3.98	3.82	4.25	2	1
Close	Distant	4.29	4.16	4.45	2	1
Happy	Sad	4.52	4.28	4.84	2	1
Fighter	Peacemaker*	2.79	2.53	3.13	2	1
Independent	Dependent*	4.22	3.84	4.67	2	1
Giving	Receiving	4.29	4.28	4.35	2	1

[a]Each DSCCS item pair is presented here so that the left-hand item covers scale points 6, 5, 4 and the right-hand item scale points 3, 2, 1. (In the administration of the instrument the left-right direction of items was randomized.)

[b]The N of the total group is larger than the combined Ns of the two criterion groups because of attrition in the sample at the criterion phase when the self-evaluations of competence were obtained.

[c]A rank of 1 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 6; a rank of 2 indicates that the mean rating of the group was closer to scale point 1.

*$p < .05$ based on X^2 (two-tailed test).

Table 7

Comparison of DSCCS Items Which Yielded Significant Differences in Responses to MYSELF AS A CHILD and MYSELF NOW on Criterion Measures Related to Hypothesis 5*

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments				Subjects' Self-Evaluations			
		Overall Relations with Children: Outstanding vs. Fair/Poor		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Capable	Helpless								
Rational	Irrational								
Brave	Fearful			Shy		Outg	Outg		
Defies authority	Respects auth.	F/P							
Popular	Left out								
Bossy	Unassertive					Outg	Outg		
Adequate	Inadequate								
Playful	Serious								
Rebellious	Conforming								
Harmonious	Conflicted						Outg		
Self-confident	Unsure							Slow	
Spontaneous	Reserved			Outg			Outg		
Achievement-oriented	Easy going								
Competitive	Noncompet.	O						Gift	
Prefers children	Prefers adults								
Boisterous	Quiet								
Loved	Unloved	O							
Leader	Follower								
Friendly	Aloof								
Abstract	Concrete								
Happy-go-lucky	Sober						Outg	Slow	
Self-reliant	Dependent					Outg	Outg		
Controlled	Impulsive								

Table 7 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments				Subjects' Self-Evaluations			
		Overall Relations with Children Outstanding vs. Fair/Poor		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Instructing	Instructed	F/P	O						
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.								
Optimistic	Pessimistic								
Coping	Avoiding					Outg			
Old for age	Young for age								
Stormy	Placid		F/P						
Secure	Insecure						Outg		
Sense of humor	Humorless								
Belonging	Lonely								
Efficient	Inefficient								
Flexible	Inflexible								
Fast	Slow		F/P						
Resourceful	Needy								
Imaginative	Practical								
Outgoing	Shy				Outg		Outg		
Trusting	Wary								
Gifted	Ordinary							Gift	Gift
Influential	Influenced								
Responsible	Carefree	O		Shy					
Bright	Dull								
Patient	Impatient			Shy					
Warm	Cool								
Relaxed	Tense								
Logical	Intuitive								

Table 7 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments				Subjects' Self-Evaluations			
		Overall Relations with Children: Outstanding vs. Fair/Poor		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Outgoing vs. Shy Children		Best with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Aggressive	Timid								
Extroverted	Introverted					Outg			
Cheerful	Solemn								
Dominant	Subordinate								
Cool	Emotional								
Tough	Oversensitive								
Active	Passive						Outg		
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	O							
Close	Distant								
Happy	Sad								
Fighter	Peacemaker							Slow	
Independent	Dependent							Slow	
Giving	Receiving			Shy					
	Totals	6	3	5	1	5	9	6	1

*DSCCS item pairs showing significant group differences ($p < .05$, based on χ^2 two-tailed test) are indicated by designation of the criterion group which more frequently selected the left-hand item of a given pair in describing the self as child or the self now.

Table 8

DSCCS Item Pairs Which Yielded Significant Differences on
MYSELF AS A CHILD and MYSELF NOW in Five Supplementary Analyses*

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments				Subjects' Preferences				Subjects' Self-Evaluations	
		Effectiveness in Public vs. Private Schls[1]		Effectiveness with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners[2]		Public vs. Private Schl[3]		Age Level[4]		Overall Relations with Children: Very Good vs. Good[5]	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Capable	Helpless										
Rational	Irrational										
Brave	Fearful										
Defies authority	Respects autn.										
Popular	Left out										
Bossy	Unassertive								8+		
Adequate	Inadequate										
Playful	Serious										
Rebellious	Conforming										
Harmonious	Conflicted										
Self-confident	Unsure	Pub									
Spontaneous	Reserved										
Achievement-oriented	Easy going										
Competitive	Noncompet.										
Prefers children	Prefers adults										
Boisterous	Quiet										
Loved	Unloved					Pub					
Leader	Follower	Pub									
Friendly	Aloof										
Abstract	Concrete	Pri									

Table 8 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments: Effectiveness in Public vs. Private Schls[1]		Advisor Judgments: Effectiveness with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners[2]		Subjects' Preferences: Public vs. Private Schl[3]		Subjects' Preferences: Age Level[4]		Subjects' Self-Evaluations: Overall Relations with Children: Very good vs. Good[5]	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Happy-go-lucky	Sober		Pub								
Self-reliant	Dependent										
Controlled	Impulsive					Pub					
Instructing	Instructed					Pub					V.G.
Unselfconscious	Self-consc.			Slow Lnrs							
Optimistic	Pessimistic		Pub			Pub	Pub				
Coping	Avoiding										
Old for age	Young for age										
Stormy	Placid	Pri									
Secure	Insecure	Pub				Pub					
Sense of humor	Humorless										
Belonging	Lonely										
Efficient	Inefficient										
Flexible	Inflexible										
Fast	Slow	Pub				Pub	Pub				
Resourceful	Needy										
Imaginative	Practical										
Outgoing	Shy										
Trusting	Wary										
Gifted	Ordinary										
Influential	Influenced	Pub	Pub								
Responsible	Carefree										
[illegible]	[illegible]										

Table 8 (cont.)

DSCCS Scaled Items		Advisor Judgments				Subjects' Preferences				Subjects' Self-Evaluations	
		Effectiveness in Public vs. Private Schls[1]		Effectiveness with Gifted Children vs. Slow Learners[2]		Public vs. Private Schl[3]		Age Level[4]		Overall Relations with Children: Very Good vs. Good[5]	
		Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now	Self as Child	Self Now
Patient	Impatient										
Warm	Cool										
Relaxed	Tense	Pub									
Logical	Intuitive	Pub				Pub					
Aggressive	Timid										
Extroverted	Introverted	Pub									
Cheerful	Solemn										
Dominant	Subordinate								-5 8+		
Cool	Emotional	Pub	Pub				Pub				
Tough	Oversensitive										
Active	Passive	Pub				Pub					
Comfortable	Ill-at-ease	Pub									
Close	Distant										
Happy	Sad										
Fighter	Peacemaker					Pub					
Independent	Dependent			Slow Lnrs					-5 8+		
Giving	Receiving										

*DSCCS item pairs showing significant group differences ($p < .05$, based on χ^2, two-tailed test) are indicated by designation of the criterion group which more frequently selected the left-hand item of a given pair in describing the self as child or the self now.

[1]Public School, N=36; Private School, N=31. Minor categories (i.e., Day Care and "Other") were excluded from this analysis. [2]Gifted Children, N=46; Slow Learners, N=35. [3]Public School, N=40; Private School, N=19. [4]Below 5 years, N=21; 5-7 years, N=36; 8 years and above, N=19. [5]Very Good, N=30; Good, N=42. The category Fair, in which only four subjects placed themselves, was excluded from this analysis.

References

Biber, B., & Bernard, V. S. Teacher education in mental health: from the point of view of the educator (Biber), from the point of view of the psychiatrist (Bernard). In M. Krugman (Ed.), Orthopsychiatry and the school. American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1958.

Bettelheim, B. A home for the heart. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.

Colombotos, J. L. Sources of professionalism: a study of high school teachers. U.S. Office of Educational Cooperative Research Project #330. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1962.

Davis, A., & Havighurst, R. J. Social class and color differences in child-rearing. American Sociological Review, 1946, 11, 698-710.

Getzels, J. W., & Jackson, P. W. The teacher's personality and characteristics. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally & Co., 1963, pp. 506-581.

Havighurst, R. J., & Neugarten, B. L. Society and education. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1967.

Havighurst, R. J., & Levine, D. U. Education in metropolitan areas. Boston, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Mindak, W. A. Fitting the semantic differential to the marketing problem. In J. G. Snider & C. E. Osgood (Eds.), Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Murray, H. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Osgood, C. E., & Luria, Z. A blind analysis of a case of multiple personality using the semantic differential. In J. G. Snider & C. E. Osgood (Eds.), Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Osgood, C. E., & Suci, G. J. Factor analysis of meaning. In J. G. Snider & C. E. Osgood (Eds.), Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Rosen, J. L. Personality factors in the reactions of child-care workers to emotionally disturbed children. Psychiatry, 1963, 26, 3, 257-265.

Rosen, J. L. Personality and first-year teachers' relationships with children: some preliminary concepts. The School Review, 1968, 76, 3, 294-311.

Rosen, J. L. Matching teachers with children. The School Review, 1972, 80, 3, 409-431.

Rosen, J. L. The remembered childhood self as forecaster of teacher-child relations. ERIC: Research in Education, 1974, 9, 2.

Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E., & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Tanner, L. N., & Lindgren, H. C. Classroom teaching and learning: a mental health approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Wright, B. D., & Tuska, S. A. Study of teacher trainees' attitudes toward significant others, 1962. University of Chicago, Graduate School of Education (mimeo).

Wright, B. D., & Tuska, S. A. The childhood romance theory of teacher development. The School Review, 1967, 75, 123-154.

APPENDIX A

DEVELOPMENTAL SELF AND
CHILD CONCEPT SCALES (DSCCS)

NOTE

The first three sections of the DSCCS--MYSELF AS A CHILD, MYSELF NOW, and FAMILY RELATIONS--were filled out by the student teachers in the fall of the academic year. For half the students, MYSELF AS A CHILD appeared before MYSELF NOW. For the other half, this order was reversed.

The fourth and fifth sections--A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH and A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH--were filled out in the spring of the academic year.

The items in all sections were presented double spaced on legal-sized paper for easy reading. They are presented here in single spaced format to reduce the length of each section.

Throughout this study, only code numbers appeared on the instruments in order to preserve the anonymity of participants.

Dear Student:

The attached questionnaire is part of a study which we hope will be useful to teacher educators in planning for the personal/professional guidance of their students.

We are asking you to help us in this study by filling out this preliminary version of the questionnaire. We will contact you once more in the spring to ask for your help in the second phase of the study. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE READ CAREFULLY BEFORE BEGINNING

There are three sections in this questionnaire. The first two sections consist of pairs of adjectives. In each of these sections you are asked to think of yourself from a certain point of view (identified at the top of each page) and to use the pairs of adjectives to describe how you see yourself from that point of view.

EXAMPLE: One of the sections asks you to think of yourself as a child. One of the adjective pairs might be:

active O o . . o O passive

You would decide (1) whether you were more on the active or the passive side, and (2) how active or passive you feel you were. If you recall that you were more active than passive, you would concentrate on the active (left) side of the item. Then,

if you think you were very active, you would circle O;
if you think you were rather active, you would circle o;
if you think you were slightly active, you would circle .

Thus, if you thought of yourself as rather active, the item would be circled like this:

active O (o) . . o O passive

Please make only ONE circle between EACH pair of the adjectives.

These same instructions apply to the third section of the questionnaire, which contains pairs of phrases.

Please answer every item on each page but do not deliberate on any one. The best answer is an impressionistic one. Please go straight through the questionnaire without referring back or looking ahead.

Think back to when you were a child. How would you describe yourself?

MYSELF AS A CHILD

Capable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Helpless
Rational	O	o	.	.	o	O	Irrational
Fearful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Brave
Defies authority	O	o	.	.	o	O	Respects authority
Popular	O	o	.	.	o	O	Left out
Bossy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Unassertive
Inadequate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Adequate
Playful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Serious
Rebellious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conforming
Harmonious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conflicted
Unsure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-confident
Spontaneous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Reserved
Achievement-oriented	O	o	.	.	o	O	Easy going
Noncompetitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Competitive
Prefers adults	O	o	.	.	o	O	Prefers children
Boisterous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Quiet
Unloved	O	o	.	.	o	O	Loved
Follower	O	o	.	.	o	O	Leader
Friendly	O	o	.	.	o	O	Aloof
Abstract	O	o	.	.	o	O	Concrete
Sober	O	o	.	.	o	O	Happy-go-lucky
Dependent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-reliant
Impulsive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Controlled
Instructing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Instructed
Unselfconscious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-conscious
Optimistic	O	o	.	.	o	O	Pessimistic
Coping	O	o	.	.	o	O	Avoiding
Old for age	O	o	.	.	o	O	Young for age
Placid	O	o	.	.	o	O	Stormy
Secure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Insecure
Sense of humor	O	o	.	.	o	O	Humorless
Lonely	O	o	.	.	o	O	Belonging
Efficient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Inefficient
Inflexible	O	o	.	.	o	O	Flexible
Fast	O	o	.	.	o	O	Slow
Resourceful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Needy
Practical	O	o	.	.	o	O	Imaginative
Outgoing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Shy
Wary	O	o	.	.	o	O	Trusting
Gifted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ordinary
Influential	O	o	.	.	o	O	Influenced
Carefree	O	o	.	.	o	O	Responsible
Dull	O	o	.	.	o	O	Bright
Impatient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Patient
Cool	O	o	.	.	o	O	Warm
Relaxed	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tense
Intuitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Logical

MYSELF AS A CHILD

Aggressive	C	o	.	.	o	O	Timid
Extroverted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Introverted
Cheerful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Solemn
Subordinate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dominant
Emotional	O	o	.	.	o	O	Cool
Oversensitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tough
Passive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Active
Comfortable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ill-at-ease
Distant	O	o	.	.	o	O	Close
Happy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Sad
Peacemaker	O	o	.	.	o	O	Fighter
Independent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dependent
Receiving	O	o	.	.	o	O	Giving

In answering this section, approximately how old were you thinking of yourself as being?

Think of yourself at this stage in your life. How would you describe yourself?

MYSELF NOW

Capable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Helpless
Rational	O	o	.	.	o	O	Irrational
Fearful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Brave
Defies authority	O	o	.	.	o	O	Respects authority
Popular	O	o	.	.	o	O	Left out
Bossy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Unassertive
Inadequate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Adequate
Playful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Serious
Rebellious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conforming
Harmonious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conflicted
Unsure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-confident
Spontaneous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Reserved
Achievement-oriented	O	o	.	.	o	O	Easy going
Noncompetitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Competitive
Prefers adults	O	o	.	.	o	O	Prefers children
Boisterous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Quiet
Unloved	O	o	.	.	o	O	Loved
Follower	O	o	.	.	o	O	Leader
Friendly	O	o	.	.	o	O	Aloof
Abstract	O	o	.	.	o	O	Concrete
Sober	O	o	.	.	o	O	Happy-go-lucky
Dependent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-reliant
Impulsive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Controlled
Instructing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Instructed
Unselfconscious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-conscious
Optimistic	O	o	.	.	o	O	Pessimistic
Coping	O	o	.	.	o	O	Avoiding
Old for age	O	o	.	.	o	O	Young for age
Placid	O	o	.	.	o	O	Stormy
Secure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Insecure
Sense of humor	O	o	.	.	o	O	Humorless
Lonely	O	o	.	.	o	O	Belonging
Efficient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Inefficient
Inflexible	O	o	.	.	o	O	Flexible
Fast	O	o	.	.	o	O	Slow
Resourceful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Needy
Practical	O	o	.	.	o	O	Imaginative
Outgoing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Shy
Wary	O	o	.	.	o	O	Trusting
Gifted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ordinary
Influential	O	o	.	.	o	O	Influenced
Carefree	O	o	.	.	o	O	Responsible
Dull	O	o	.	.	o	O	Bright
Impatient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Patient
Cool	O	o	.	.	o	O	Warm
Relaxed	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tense
Intuitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Logical

MYSELF NOW

Aggressive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Timid
Extroverted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Introverted
Cheerful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Solemn
Subordinate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dominant
Emotional	O	o	.	.	o	O	Cool
Oversensitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tough
Passive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Active
Comfortable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ill-at-ease
Distant	O	o	.	.	o	O	Close
Happy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Sad
Peacemaker	O	o	.	.	o	O	Fighter
Independent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dependent
Receiving	O	o	.	.	o	O	Giving

FAMILY RELATIONS

AS A CHILD, I FELT MY PARENTS

Almost always understood me	O	o	.	.	o	O	Almost never understood me

THROUGHOUT MY LIFE, I HAVE SEEN MY PARENTS AS

Almost always giving me support and good advice	O	o	.	.	o	O	Almost never giving me support and good advice

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY PARENTS

Set many limits on my behavior	O	o	.	.	o	O	Set almost no limits on my behavior

IN THE COURSE OF GROWING UP

I rebelled actively against my parents	O	o	.	.	o	O	I hardly rebelled at all against my parents

I WOULD DESCRIBE MY FAMILY AS

Warm, close-knit	O	o	.	.	o	O	Distant, loosely-knit

WHEN I WAS A CHILD, MY PARENTS

Often punished me	O	o	.	.	o	O	Almost never punished me

WHEN I THINK ABOUT IT, MY BASIC VALUES NOW ARE

Those I learned from my parents as a child	O	o	.	.	o	O	Quite different from those of my parents

AS A CHILD, I FELT CLOSEST TO

My mother (or mother surrogate)	O	o	.	.	o	O	My father (or father surrogate)

Dear Student:

Thank you for your willingness to cooperate in this final stage of our study. There are two sections in this questionnaire. The format will be familiar to you. In the fall we asked you to think of yourself in responding to the questionnaire. Now we are asking you to think of certain children you have worked with.

Thanks again for helping us out.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

INSTRUCTIONS: PLEASE READ CAREFULLY BEFORE BEGINNING

In each section of the questionnaire, you are asked to think of a specific child and to characterize him or her using the pairs of adjectives provided. For example, if you are presented with the following pair of adjectives:

active O o . . o O passive

you would decide (1) whether the child you are describing is more active or passive, and (2) how active or passive you see him or her as being. If you decide that the child is more active than passive, you would concentrate on the active side of the item. Then,

if you see the child as being very active, you would circle O;
if you see the child as being rather active, you would circle o;
if you see the child as being slightly active, you would circle .

Thus, if you saw the child as being rather active, the item would look like this:

active O (o) . . o O passive

Please make only ONE circle between EACH pair according to which of the adjectives is most appropriate in general.

Answer every item, but do not deliberate on any one. The best answer is an impressionistic one. Please go straight through the questionnaire without referring back or looking ahead.

Think of a child you have especially enjoyed working with. How would you describe him/her?

A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH

Capable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Helpless
Rational	O	o	.	.	o	O	Irrational
Fearful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Brave
Defies authority	O	o	.	.	o	O	Respects authority
Popular	O	o	.	.	o	O	Left out
Bossy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Unassertive
Inadequate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Adequate
Playful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Serious
Rebellious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conforming
Harmonious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conflicted
Unsure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-confident
Spontaneous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Reserved
Achievement-oriented	O	o	.	.	o	O	Easy going
Noncompetitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Competitive
Prefers adults	O	o	.	.	o	O	Prefers children
Boisterous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Quiet
Unloved	O	o	.	.	o	O	Loved
Follower	O	o	.	.	o	O	Leader
Friendly	O	o	.	.	o	O	Aloof
Abstract	O	o	.	.	o	O	Concrete
Sober	O	o	.	.	o	O	Happy-go-lucky
Dependent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-reliant
Impulsive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Controlled
Instructing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Instructed
Unselfconscious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-conscious
Optimistic	O	o	.	.	o	O	Pessimistic
Coping	O	o	.	.	o	O	Avoiding
Old for age	O	o	.	.	o	O	Young for age
Placid	O	o	.	.	o	O	Stormy
Secure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Insecure
Sense of humor	O	o	.	.	o	O	Humorless
Lonely	O	o	.	.	o	O	Belonging
Efficient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Inefficient
Inflexible	O	o	.	.	o	O	Flexible
Fast	O	o	.	.	o	O	Slow
Resourceful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Needy
Practical	O	o	.	.	o	O	Imaginative
Outgoing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Shy
Wary	O	o	.	.	o	O	Trusting
Gifted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ordinary
Influential	O	o	.	.	o	O	Influenced
Carefree	O	o	.	.	o	O	Responsible
Dull	O	o	.	.	o	O	Bright
Impatient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Patient
Cool	O	o	.	.	o	O	Warm
Relaxed	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tense
Intuitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Logical

A CHILD I HAVE ESPECIALLY ENJOYED WORKING WITH

Aggressive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Timid
Extroverted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Introverted
Cheerful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Solemn
Subordinate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dominant
Emotional	O	o	.	.	o	O	Cool
Oversensitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tough
Passive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Active
Comfortable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ill-at-ease
Distant	O	o	.	.	o	O	Close
Happy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Sad
Peacemaker	O	o	.	.	o	O	Fighter
Independent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dependent
Receiving	O	o	.	.	o	O	Giving

How old was the child you have just described? _____

Was it a boy or a girl? _____

Think of a child you have least enjoyed working with. How would you describe him/her?

A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH

Capable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Helpless
Rational	O	o	.	.	o	O	Irrational
Fearful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Brave
Defies authority	O	o	.	.	o	O	Respects authority
Popular	O	o	.	.	o	O	Left out
Bossy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Unassertive
Inadequate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Adequate
Playful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Serious
Rebellious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conforming
Harmonious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Conflicted
Unsure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-confident
Spontaneous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Reserved
Achievement-oriented	O	o	.	.	o	O	Easy going
Noncompetitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Competitive
Prefers adults	O	o	.	.	o	O	Prefers children
Boisterous	O	o	.	.	o	O	Quiet
Unloved	O	o	.	.	o	O	Loved
Follower	O	o	.	.	o	O	Leader
Friendly	O	o	.	.	o	O	Aloof
Abstract	O	o	.	.	o	O	Concrete
Sober	O	o	.	.	o	O	Happy-go-lucky
Dependent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-reliant
Impulsive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Controlled
Instructing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Instructed
Unselfconscious	O	o	.	.	o	O	Self-conscious
Optimistic	O	o	.	.	o	O	Pessimistic
Coping	O	o	.	.	o	O	Avoiding
Old for age	O	o	.	.	o	O	Young for age
Placid	O	o	.	.	o	O	Stormy
Secure	O	o	.	.	o	O	Insecure
Sense of humor	O	o	.	.	o	O	Humorless
Lonely	O	o	.	.	o	O	Belonging
Efficient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Inefficient
Inflexible	O	o	.	.	o	O	Flexible
Fast	O	o	.	.	o	O	Slow
Resourceful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Needy
Practical	O	o	.	.	o	O	Imaginative
Outgoing	O	o	.	.	o	O	Shy
Wary	O	o	.	.	o	O	Trusting
Gifted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ordinary
Influential	O	o	.	.	o	O	Influenced
Carefree	O	o	.	.	o	O	Responsible
Dull	O	o	.	.	o	O	Bright
Impatient	O	o	.	.	o	O	Patient
Cool	O	o	.	.	o	O	Warm
Relaxed	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tense
Intuitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Logical

A CHILD I HAVE LEAST ENJOYED WORKING WITH

Aggressive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Timid
Extroverted	O	o	.	.	o	O	Introverted
Cheerful	O	o	.	.	o	O	Solemn
Subordinate	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dominant
Emotional	O	o	.	.	o	O	Cool
Oversensitive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Tough
Passive	O	o	.	.	o	O	Active
Comfortable	O	o	.	.	o	O	Ill-at-ease
Distant	O	o	.	.	o	O	Close
Happy	O	o	.	.	o	O	Sad
Peacemaker	O	o	.	.	o	O	Fighter
Independent	O	o	.	.	o	O	Dependent
Receiving	O	o	.	.	o	O	Giving

How old was the child you have just described? _____

Was it a boy or a girl? _____

APPENDIX B

STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTE

The questionnaire for the student teachers was administered in the spring of the academic year, following the last two sections of the DSCCS (see Appendix A).

Throughout this study, only code numbers appeared on the instruments in order to preserve the anonymity of participants.

Questionnaire for Student Teachers

If you could find exactly the kind of teaching job you most want, how would you describe it in terms of the following?

1. The age group I would most like to work with is: (CHECK ONE)

___ below 2 years
___ 2 through 4 year olds
___ 5 through 7 year olds
___ 8 through 10 year olds
___ 11 year olds or older

2. I would prefer to work in: (CHECK ONE)

___ a public school
___ a private school
___ a day care center
___ other (specify) _____

Having now had classroom experience as part of your professional development, how would you describe yourself regarding the following?

3. If I had to choose, I would feel more competent in working with children who, in general: (CHECK ONE)

___ are on the shy, withdrawn, passive side
___ are on the outgoing, assertive, active side

4. If I had to choose, I feel that I could work more effectively with children who: (CHECK ONE)

___ are intellectually gifted
___ are slow learners or have specific learning difficulties

5. In my work with children thus far, I would describe the way in which I relate to children in general as: (CHECK ONE)

___ very good (little or no further work needed in this area)
___ good (still need some work in this area)
___ fair (still need quite a bit of work in this area)

APPENDIX C

ADVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTE

The questionnaire for the advisors was filled out in the spring of the academic year.

Throughout this study, only code numbers appeared on the instruments in order to preserve the anonymity of participants.

Questionnaire for Advisors

In terms of your knowledge of the student whose name has been given to you, if you could find exactly the kind of teaching job in which she (he) is likely to be most effective, how would you describe it in terms of the following?

1. The age group the student is likely to work with most effectively is: (CHECK ONE)

   ___ below 2 years
   ___ 2 through 4 year olds
   ___ 5 through 7 year olds
   ___ 8 through 10 year olds
   ___ 11 year olds or older

2. In what kind of setting do you think the student could make the best use of her (his) personal/professional abilities? (CHECK ONE)

   ___ a public school
   ___ a private school
   ___ a day care center
   ___ other (specify) _____

From what you have observed of the student, how would you describe her (him) regarding the following?

3. The student appears more competent in relation to children who, in general: (CHECK ONE):

   ___ are on the shy, withdrawn, passive side
   ___ are on the outgoing, assertive, active side

4. If the student were to work with children who are outside the "average" range of intelligence, the student would probably be more competent in relation to children who tend toward: (CHECK ONE)

   ___ the intellectually gifted end
   ___ the slow learning end

5. Irrespective of other aspects of the student's teaching performance, how would you describe her (his) overall ability to relate to children (i.e., to respond to children sensitively and appropriately; with empathy, yet retaining adult identity)? (CHECK ONE)

   ___ Outstanding (a "natural" with children; essentially needs no further work in this area)
   ___ Good (builds relatively solid relationships, but needs some work in this area)
   ___ Fair (is able to build relationships, but these are quite uneven; needs considerable work in this area)
   ___ Poor (probably should move into a role that does not entail close day-to-day contacts with children)